

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

Gauging Perceptions of Participation in Participatory Development

A South African Case: The Mud Schools Eradication Project at Klapmuts Primary School in the Western Cape

A dissertation submitted to the Sociology Department of the University of Cape Town in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy.

By Mavourneen Street

July 2010

Acknowledgements

I'd like to extend my gratitude to my supervisor, Jacques de Wet, who encouraged, guided and supported me through this thesis. To the IDT and the staff and parents of Klapmuts Primary School and the members of the school building project, thank you for your enthusiastic cooperation in this research. Thanks to the Surplus People's Project, the Centre for Conflict Resolution and Impumelelo for helping me in my initial research.

I am heartily thankful to my family for your continued support and encouragement, with special thanks to my amazing parents. Your love, faith, support, encouragement, meticulous reading and other nutrients have, once again, inspired and sustained me through a personally important endeavour. To my friends, thanks awesome people for gently keeping me on track and in front of my laptop.

Finally, thanks to the Great Creator for the directive, creative energy and support that allowed me to do this work.

Abstract

People-centred development places a great deal of emphasis on the participation of the "beneficiaries" (or what I call targets) in the process of their development. The language of participatory development is often used in development programmes in South Africa, but very little is said about how participation is measured.

In this thesis I grapple with the problem of how to measure participation in participatory development. I have designed and tested an instrument based on Arnstein's well known ladder of participation in order to gauge perceptions of participation. I reflect critically on this process, identify limitations in gauging perceptions of the levels of participation, and critique Arnstein's model. The case used to test the instrument I designed was a school building development project which was undertaken by the Independent Development Trust (IDT) as part of their Mud Schools Eradication Programme in the community of Klapmuts in the Western Cape. The methods I used for data collection included archival and documentary research, participant observation and semi-structured interviews. I drew on Miles and Huberman's (1994: 10-12) three step iterative process of data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing to analyse the data. I also made use of NVivo, which is a computer software package for qualitative data analysis.

Key findings include the observation that some of Arnstein's descriptions provide a useful basis for indicators to measure perceptions of participation while others do not. The instrument, which I designed for this study, was effectively used to place the respondents' perceptions of the level of the targets' participation in the IDT development project on Arnstein's ladder of participation. I discuss how the use of this instrument can support the adoption of effective participatory approaches in development interventions that promote substantive democracy and decrease structural violence. The instrument does not gauge reasons for perceptions nor does it measure equity in participation. I, therefore, recommend that in order to more comprehensively assess participatory practices used in development a three-pronged approach should be applied, which includes gauging the level of participation perceived, understanding the reasons for this perception, and understanding the level of equity of participation amongst the targets. The instrument created in this thesis only addresses the first of these three. Measures for the other two elements still need to be designed and tested.

Declaration

I, Mavourneen Street, declare that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted in part or whole for any award of any degree. This work is my own and any substantial contributions to and quotations in the dissertation have been cited and referenced.

Singed.....

Dated.....

University of Cape Town

Table of Contents

Chapter One Introduction	3
Chapter Two Background	10
2.1. Introduction.....	10
2.2. The Independent Development Trust.....	10
2.3. The Mud Schools Eradication Programme.....	11
2.4. Klappmuts Community and Klappmuts Primary School.....	11
2.5. Rebuilding Klappmuts Primary School	12
Chapter Three Conceptualisation of the Research Problem.....	14
3.1. Introduction.....	14
3.2. Central Research Question	14
3.3. Key Concepts in the Central Research Question	15
Chapter Four Methodology	36
4.1. Introduction.....	36
4.2. Overall Design.....	36
4.3. A Note on Research Ethics	37
4.4. Methods of data collection.....	38
4.5. Methods of Analysis	45
Chapter Five Results	57
5.1. Introduction.....	57
5.2. Placing of Respondents on the Ladder	58
5.3. Trends amongst Groups.....	61
5.3. Summary of the Results	78
Chapter Six Discussion	79
6.1 Introduction.....	79
6.2. Can Arnstein's Work be Used as the Basis of a Tool to Gauge Perceptions of Participation?.....	79
6.3. Justification for Measuring Perceptions of Participation Using Ladders	81
6.4. Reasons and Benefits of Perceptions of Placation.....	82
6.7. The Usefulness of Measuring the Levels of Participation in the broader Political Context.....	84
Chapter Seven Conclusions and Recommendations	86
7.1. Conclusion.....	86
7.2. Recommendations	88
Bibliography.....	90
Background Interviews.....	93

List of Appendices

- Appendix A: Map of Klapmuts94
- Appendix B: Benefits and Costs involved in using a participatory development approach (Davids et al., 2009:19)95
- Appendix C: Question from the Interview Schedule that Informed the Final Set of Indicators96
- Appendix D: Hierarchical Coding System of the Data Display and Analysis Process98
- Appendix E: Excluded Indicators and Reasons for Their Exclusion.....100
- Appendix F: Consent Form107
- Appendix G: DoE Accommodation Schedule108
- Appendix H: Transcript of Outsider 6109

Chapter One Introduction

The motivation for this thesis stems from the need for instruments to assess and support the effective implementation of people-centred¹ development interventions (Davids et al., 2009: 109). The thesis is a descriptive qualitative study that contributes to evaluative research (Babbie and Mouton, 2001: 80 - 81). My aim was to design and test an instrument based on Arnstein's (1969) ladder of participation, to gauge perceptions of participation in participatory development.

In the process of designing this instrument I have also identified limitations in gauging perceptions of the levels of participation. I hope that the design of the instrument and this study supports the adoption of effective participatory approaches in development interventions. The instrument was tested on the Mud Schools Eradication Programme run by the Independent Development Trust in Klapmuts in the Western Cape. The respondents were a mixture of professionals (who were the benefactors otherwise known as the Outsiders) and teachers (who were the beneficiaries otherwise known as the Targets).

Participatory methods became popular in development because development practitioners realised that top-down generic programmes were not meeting local needs (Chambers, 1995: 30-32). People-centred development theorists and practitioners, such as Robert Chambers, David Korten and Manfred Max-Neef, argued that participation could be used as a cost effective method to empower the Targets of development to achieve sustainable outcomes.

Chambers (1995: 37-38) argues that the application of participatory approaches demonstrates that insiders, or local Targets of interventions, are as capable as Outsider experts in assessing, implementing and evaluating development initiatives.

¹ See Davids et al. for an in-depth explanation of the humanist approach (Davids et al., 2009: 109). Humanism, people-centred approaches and participation will be explored in greater depth in Chapter 3 of this dissertation.

He advocates decreasing power differences between the traditionally less powerful Targets and the more powerful Outsiders, by promoting dialogue between the Outsiders and the Targets, and by Outsiders taking a lead from the Targets (Chambers, 1995: 37).

According to Chambers the process should empower the Targets sufficiently so that the Outsiders can assume a supporting role and participate in the Targets' programme, not the other way around (Chambers, 1995: 31). Chambers shows that capacity building operates best when programmes are driven by the Targets rather than the Outsiders (Chambers, 1995: 38 – 39). In this way the process facilitates a lateral rather than hierarchical power arrangement between Targets and Outsiders.

A lateral power arrangement and the promotion of dialogue fit well with Heller's description of substantive democracy (Heller, 2000). In Heller's description of substantive democracy citizens participate in decision-making with government on how government spends tax money. The participation results in citizens influencing development programmes that affect them and are funded by tax money (Heller, 2000). Participatory structures are potentially a means of protecting against structural violence² in that they can decrease inequity in power relations.

Participatory approaches to development are to be supported for the reasons given above. However the success of the approach depends on the circumstances of the intervention and the type of participatory approach adopted. Various authors, (including Cook and Kothari, 2001; Stiefel and Wolfe, 1994 and Roodt 2001), argue that the use of ad hoc participatory approaches by NGOs and governments does not result in any real power shifts and that participation by vulnerable Targets is window dressing.

This demonstrates a massive gap between practice and rhetoric (Davids et al., 2009: 114).

² Galtung discusses structural or indirect violence as a form of violence where there is no direct person to person violence but where 'violence is built in the structure and shows up as unequal power and consequently unequal life chances.' (Galtung, 1969: 171-172)

A variety of different types or modes of participation will be explored in greater depth in Chapter Three. De Beer distinguishes two modes of participation: one is weak where the Targets are involved but decisions are made by Outsiders, the other is strong involving Target empowerment, capacity building and bottom up decision making (De Beer, 2000: 271-272 in Davids et al., 2009:119).

Chambers notes that gauging the type of participation understood to be used in practice would “reduce pretence and hypocrisy and improve practice” (Chambers, 2005: 106 - 107). This is a key concern for people-centred development theorists and practitioners. The perception of participation is critical here. How participation happens on paper, the degree to which Targets of interventions are said to influence a programme and how much they feel or perceive themselves to influence a programme can be very different. The way in which both Targets and Outsiders feel or perceive the Targets to be influencing the programme is important to understand and measure because it is through these perceptions that true shifts in power take place.

Perceptions might not reflect the objective distribution of power. Participants might be manipulated into perceiving themselves to have a certain level of power and outsiders may wishfully describe participants as having more power than they do when objective facts are examined. An instrument could be designed to examine objective facts, which can be used to corroborate or contradict perceptions and provide a more comprehensive understanding of the levels of participation experienced by the participants. However designing such an instrument would be a complex task, which is beyond the scope of what was possible in this thesis.

Pretty, Guijet, Scoones and Thompson (1995) present seven different concepts of public participation (Davids et al., 2009: 116 -117) and rank these from concepts closer to involvement to concepts tending towards empowerment. These authors have called this ranking a ladder of participation.

Arnstein is one such author who has designed a ladder of participation which ranked different forms of participation from manipulation to citizen control. She described these forms and their applications to United States federal social programmes in her 1969 article: *A Ladder of Citizen Participation*. The instrument designed for this thesis is based on Arnstein's work and the process of designing this tool demonstrates the limits and usefulness of Arnstein's work.

Arnstein's work is used because she gives more in-depth explanations of the levels than the other authors do and because she bases her work on case studies. The case-studies help to actualise the description of the levels of participation and their application to an actual social programme. The levels described by Arnstein and used in this thesis are described in Chapter Three: Conceptualising of the Research Question.

Njombi (2006) and Murambiwa (2008) have used Arnstein to test levels of participation. Njombi's (2006) thesis sought to investigate "the extent to which beneficiaries were participating in development interventions by Non Governmental Organisations that claimed to use a participatory approach". This was done by investigating how to determine the form that participation took in a development intervention that claimed to use a participatory approach. (Njombi, 2006: 5) In terms of indicator development Njombi summarised each level and developed one to two indicators per level. Njombi's research aimed to describe the different levels of participation generally. Using respondent perspectives and other evidence Murambiwa's thesis attempted to "test and refine an instrument, which can be used to assess the extent to which beneficiaries participate in development interventions." (Murambiwa, 2008: 2) In her discussion she explains the difficulty she experiences with conceptualising indicators from Arnstein's description of the different levels in the ladder. Murambiwa and Njombi summarise Arnstein's descriptions. I decided to do a more in-depth and exhaustive analysis of Arnstein's descriptions in an effort to produce an exhaustive set of indicators of each level.

Although I found their work useful I didn't use any of the indicators they developed. I found that they summarised Arnstein's descriptions of the levels to create indicators and didn't criticise Arnstein's work. I chose to adopt a different approach to the development of indicators. I explored every possible element of Arnstein's descriptions to establish which could be converted into indicators and tested all of these so as to be critical of Arnstein's work.

Diallo wrote a doctoral thesis in philosophy at the Scripps College of Communication of Ohio University entitled, *Genuine participation in social change programmes: the experiences of benefactors and beneficiaries in Guinea*. The motivation behind the thesis was his argument that the sustainability of participatory development interventions is "strongly dependent on the level of genuine participation of their intended beneficiaries in the whole cycle of programme planning and implementation." (Diallo, 1997: 1) Diallo's dissertation shows the value of comparing the perceptions of benefactors and beneficiaries. I made use of such comparison, but I chose to call benefactors "Outsiders" and beneficiaries "Targets". The reasons for the changes in the nomenclature will be explained in Chapter Three. I distinguished the differences in the opinions of the two groups so as to clarify the power relations and communication issues related to participation.

I designed and tested an instrument that is incremental in nature and places respondents' perceptions of participation at a particular level on the ladder of participation. Each level on the ladder has its own criteria, which need to be fulfilled for a perception to be classified at that level. For a perception to be placed on the second level of participation the criteria for the first level must be fulfilled as well as the criteria for the second level. This pattern is repeated for each of the six levels. In this way the ladder and the instrument measure incremental changes from the lowest level of Informing where Targets of interventions have little power over programmes to the level Citizen Control where the Targets of the interventions run the interventions.

The levels of participation that I use are: Informing, Consulting, Placation, Partnership, Delegated Power and Citizen Control. I have also used

Arnstein's descriptions of the levels to design my own instrument to gauge participation but have gone one step further by critiquing her work and describing the usefulness and limitations of her work as a basis for a tool to gauge perceptions of participation. I criticise Arnstein's work in terms of the ways in which her model (1969) contributes to gauging perceptions of participation. I critique the role of measuring perceptions of participation in improving participatory practice.

Indicators of these levels were developed and tested on an actual development programme that claimed to use a participatory approach. The development intervention was the building of a new school in an impoverished area, Klapmuts, in the Western Cape of South Africa. This initiative and the role-players involved will be described in more depth in Chapter Two: Background.

The instrument tested what the Outsiders and Targets as individuals, and as groups, perceived the level of participation of the Targets to be. The individual and group results were compared and conclusions drawn.

The final instrument is effective in gauging perceived levels of participation, but has certain limitations. The limitations are that the instrument does not test levels of equity in participation nor does it explore the reasons for the perceptions being at a particular level. These limitations are discussed in the Chapter 7: Conclusion and Recommendation. These results concur with those of Davids et al.(2009), Cook and Kothari (2001), and Hickman and Mohan (2004) in Davids et al. (2009) who argue that despite criticisms of participatory approaches to development they should still be used recognising their limitations.

These results were then positioned within the broader debates of development and participation including how measuring participation can enhance substantive democracy and guard against structural violence. The instrument potentially contributes to improved communication about participation between the different Outside and Target role-players within a participatory development intervention.

The value of my work lies in the creation of a tool that can potentially enhance the application of participatory approaches through gauging the perceptions of the level of participation. I hope that my tool will be useful in identifying levels of participation in practice and help improve communication between Outsiders and Targets through the process of mutually defining the level and their satisfaction with this level.

The second chapter in this thesis is the background chapter. The various role-players and events in the research context will be explored in this section. Chapter Three, Conceptualisation of the Research Problem, explores what the research question is and defines the various elements within the question. Chapter Four, Methodology, explores the overall research design as well as the data collection and analysis techniques. This is followed by Chapter Five, Results, where the results of the research are presented. These results are discussed in the context of the broader development debates Chapter Six, Discussion. Finally the conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter Eight.

Chapter Two Background

2.1. Introduction

The case used to test the participation instrument was a school building intervention by the Independent Development Trust (IDT) as part of their Mud Schools Eradication Programme in Klapmuts community in the Western Cape. The programme involved the demolition of the structurally unsound Klapmuts Primary School building, with a brick and mortar structure. The programme is funded predominantly by the Department of Education of South Africa (DoE) as part of their Mud Schools Eradication Programme. This is a national programme aimed at replacing structurally unsound school buildings. The Independent Development Trust (IDT) is the programme implementing agency. The IDT claim to have a participatory policy where the beneficiaries of their interventions are empowered through their involvement in the programme processes (Interview with the IDT Regional Programme Manager in April 2009).

2.2. The Independent Development Trust

The IDT was established in 1999. Its purpose is to

...support and add value to the national development agenda. It will do so by deploying its resources in the initiation and delivery of innovative and sustainable development programmes, which make a measurable difference in the levels of poverty and underdevelopment. (www.idt.org.za)

The IDT achieves its objectives through partnerships with both Government, and non-governmental organisations. The IDT CEO explained that the organisation's core business is to improve the lives of the poor through innovative developmental solutions (Nwedamutswu, 2008: 2).

A senior IDT staff member elaborates on the CEO's statement by saying that besides working to implement government programmes the IDT emphasises the importance of carrying out the work of social development in a way that maximises participation. (Interview with the IDT Regional Programme Manager in April 2009).

2.3. The Mud Schools Eradication Programme

The Mud Schools Eradication Programme is focused on school infrastructure improvement and construction (www.idt.org.za). In 2008 a number of new schools were built through the programme in the Eastern Cape. It was claimed that this intervention involved local community development and participation. (Interview with the IDT Regional Programme Manager in April 2009). The programme was launched in 2005 in the Eastern Cape. It is currently focused on the Western Cape with programme implementation and management supported by the IDT and funding and directives from the Department of Education. According to senior staff members at the IDT Cape Town branch, there is a strong participatory focus in this programme (Interview with the IDT Regional Programme Manager and Klapmuts Mud Schools Programme Managers in April 2009)

2.4. Klapmuts Community and Klapmuts Primary School

Klapmuts is a small rural hamlet which falls under the Stellenbosch municipality (MCA Africa, 2007: 1). According to the 2001 census the population of Klapmuts was approximately 4000 people (MCA Africa, 2007: 12). Fifty-five percent of the population was either below 15 years or above 65 years of age and are thus less likely to be economically active; 27% of the potentially economically active population was either unemployed or employed only during the fruit picking season.

Ninety-three percent of the population did not have a formal employment, or earned less than R1600 per month (MCA Africa, 2007: 14). Twenty-seven percent of the population lived in informal houses.

Ten percent of the population had no formal schooling and 59% had not completed matric. Poverty, unemployment and limited public facilities are listed as the some of the developmental challenges facing the Klapmuts community (MCA Africa, 2007: 13 – 41).

The Klapmuts Primary School (Appendix A) is one of the six major public facilities in the village (MCA Africa, 2007: 31). The school is the only primary school in Klapmuts and serves as the main venue for community gatherings like funerals, weddings and other church services, for adult education classes and for NGO meetings. (Interview with senior staff member at Klapmuts Primary School, 2009)

2.5. Rebuilding Klapmuts Primary School

Klapmuts Primary School is a prefabricated building that was erected in the 1980's and was meant to be a temporary structure. Since then many appeals have been made to the Department of Education for its replacement with a brick and mortar, safe school building. In 2005 the school was declared unsafe after being subjected to a structural integrity review (interview with the IDT Programme Manager, April 2009). Dangers included exposure to asbestos, holes in the floors and no protection from temperature extremes. Three years ago the Department of Education agreed to fund the building of a new school under the Mud Schools Eradication Programme (Interview with the IDT Programme Manager, April 2009).

A building programme committee was formed at the school. Programme committee meetings were one of the decision making platforms of the school building programme. This committee met every two weeks from 2008. Four school representatives, including the principal; IDT representatives, the Engineer, the Quantity Surveyor and the Architect were in attendance at these meetings. I found minutes for 9 of these meetings from May 2008 to June 2009. The Target representatives who represented the interests of the staff gave feedback to the staff after the meetings took place. There are records of feedback sessions in the staff meetings following the programme committee meetings.

The IDT are the programme managers. Once the Department of Education gave the IDT the contract to manage the programme in Klapmuts the IDT started their communication with the school via the school Principal. The IDT appointed the Architect as programme leader/ principal agent, and then appointed the Engineer and the Quantity Surveyor – they formed the professional team. The Principal introduced the idea to the teachers. Three teachers were selected to join the principal on the programme committee in planned regular meetings. The professional team was then introduced to the parents and the rest of the community.

The IDT representatives communicate with the Department of Education (DoE) representatives and are bound to bring the decisions made at the school building programme meetings to the (DoE). The school governing body is supposed to be involved in the programme, but at the time of my study it had not yet participated. At the time of my research the school building programme was at the stage of finalising building plans and the demolition of the old building. There is an obvious need for a new school and for capacity building for development in the poverty-stricken community of Klapmuts.

Chapter Three Conceptualisation of the Research Problem

3.1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to unpack my central research question and define each of the key concepts within the question. The key concepts will be explained so as to clarify the research question. They include development theory, the humanist paradigm, participation, the measurement of participation, indicators, as well as Targets and Outsiders. Concepts that are relevant to understanding participation within development theory from the perspective of the humanist paradigm include the interaction between civil society and the State in governance to support substantive democracy and reduce structural violence as well as participatory approaches within the South African context. The measurement of participation and the creation of indicators using Arnstein's (1969) framework is central to this thesis. For this reason the need for measurement as well as the methods of and problems with measurement, are explored. Arnstein's ladder and the concept of indicators are unpacked. Where, appropriate, I refer to previous studies on issues similar to those investigated in this study.

3.2. Central Research Question

The central research question is:

Is Arnstein's ladder of participation a useful basis for an instrument to be used to gauge the Targets' and the Outsiders' perceptions of participation in a South African development intervention, which claims to use a participatory approach?

3.3. Key Concepts in the Central Research Question

3.3.1. Development and the Humanist Paradigm

Participation plays an important role in the humanist paradigm of development. It is thus important to begin by unpacking the concepts of development, humanist development nestled within the broader concept of development and the role of participation within humanist development.

Development theory has been evolving since the end of World War II. Initial theories driving development were modernisation theory followed by dependency theory (Diallo, 2007 and Davids et al., 2009). A central disappointment with the modernisation and dependency theories is the lack of positive impact they had on the lives of poor people in developing countries. This led to calls by many development practitioners for a change in the development approach. In the 1970's and 1980's grassroots organisations³ debunked the legitimacy of international aid agencies' modernisation approaches to development. In the 1980's the humanist paradigm of development came to the fore as an alternative approach (Peet, 1999:138-140).

The humanist paradigm focuses on people rather than theory (Davids et al., 2009: 22)⁴. People-centred approaches are situated within this paradigm. Davids et al. presents Korten's definition of people-centred development as "a process by which the members of a society increase their personal and institutional capacities to mobilise and manage resources to produce sustainable and justly distributed improvements in their quality of life consistent with their own aspirations" (Korten 1990: 76 in Davids et al, 2009: 17).

³ Grassroots organisations and NGOs were being seen as more credible and creative than the multinational official agencies in the endogenous actualisation of 'just development' which involved 'equity, democracy... social justice (and)... economic growth' (Peet 1999:193). To actualise this credibility these grassroots organisations aimed to act as agents for the devolution of power. (Smith 2002: 389 – 399; Crook & Jerve 1991; Tordoff 1994: 555 in Davids et al, 2009: 123)

⁴ White et al., (1994); Servaes et al., (1996); and Jacobson, (2004) in Diallo, (2007) and Ebrahim (2003), in Diallo (2007) discuss this point further.

People-centred development (PCD) argues that the participation of the majority of the population, especially the vulnerable and previously excluded, is the bottom line for sustainable development (Roodt, 1996: 138). Citizen participation, and the potential for empowerment that it brings, is thus a critical element of the humanist paradigm⁵ and people-centred development (Moll, 1986:22 and Treurnicht, 1997:17 in Davids et al., 2009: 4).

Within this paradigm there is a focus on the role of the human consciousness in the development of the social reality (Davids et al. 2009: 159). The necessity of outside change agent's engagement in dialogical process with people within their own social reality to understand and improve that reality is critical to this paradigm (Davids et al., 2009: 159). Thus participatory approaches are central to the humanist conceptualisation of development and humanist development goals of transforming 'institutional, sociocultural and political systems and structures' to create a development approach that is focused on people (Davids et al. 2009: 105).

Participatory approaches are advocated within the humanist conceptualisation of development. Public participation in development involves the people as local experts, and decentralised institutions through which the people can entrench their priorities (Smith 2002: 389 – 399; Crook & Jerve 1991; Tordoff 1994: 555 in Davids et al., 2009: 123). Chambers sees participatory approaches as addressing the inadequacies of modernisation approaches because they promote an alternative bottom up strategy to help disadvantaged people, particularly those in underdeveloped countries (Chambers, 2005 and Cooke and Kothari, 2004 in Diallo, 2007: 3). Sen explains that participatory approaches can increase capabilities and empowerment of the vulnerable (Sen, 1999:18). Sen discusses the expansion of people's capabilities towards development through their influence of public policy by the "effective use of participatory capabilities by the public." (Sen, 1999:18) Sen explains that through embedding participatory processes in

⁵See also Chambers 1995 and Jacobson, 2004 in Diallo 2007 for a discussion on the dissatisfaction with macro approaches to development.

public policy systematic opportunities are created to enhance the substantive freedoms of disadvantaged people (Sen, 1999:18).

The post-apartheid South African government has also supported a participatory approach to development. This is evident in the Reconstruction and Development Programme (1994), the Constitution (1996) and the Municipal Systems Act (2000). (Davids et al., 2009: 19).

3.3.2. Using Participation to Increase Substantive Democracy and Decrease Structural Violence

Substantive democracy moves beyond formal and effective democracy (Heller, 2000: 485) to create power shifts which allow the voices and concerns of those affected by development goals, to be taken into account (Habermas 1993:145 in Romm, 1996: 213)⁶. Substantive democracy moves beyond political participation through voting to vulnerable citizens' participation in decision-making on how governments spend tax money by having a say or controlling development programmes that affect them and are funded with tax money (Heller, 2000). Through substantive democracy civil society and state relations are strengthened (Heller, 2000: 488) to develop a form of governance where the state is accountable to civil society (Kaplan, 1994) so as to protect the poor against social domination and promote social citizenship inclusive of subordinate classes (Heller: 489-490).

Substantive democracy occurs through civil participation with state in governance. Heller explains that civil society and the state are mutually reinforcing in national development (Heller, 2000). According to Weiss governance is a civic affair and is operationalised through state-civic interactions (Weiss, 2000: 800)⁷. Heller explains that through participating in

⁶ See Romm's (1996) presentation of progressive development as a form of democratic process.

⁷ Weiss discusses the powerful political influence of non-state actors including national civil society on states, as well as global governance and UN social policy and thus national and international economic and social policy (Weiss, 2000: 800).

the governance of a country vulnerable citizens decrease their vulnerability. Participatory development can enhance the roles of civil society and vulnerable citizens in democracy because it increases their direct involvement in governance. If used appropriately participatory principles in development initiatives can support substantive democracy⁸. This can otherwise be described as political participation towards substantive democracy (Heller, 2000).

Through supporting substantive democracy participation can guard against structural violence. Structural violence is a form of violence which is not direct, but rather where 'violence is built into the structure and shows up as unequal power and consequently unequal life chances.' (Galtung, 1969: 171-172) Structural violence can occur when social and economic structural conditions in the less developed countries "limit the capacity of subordinate groups to effectively exercise their rights and to secure substantive gains." (Heller, 2000: 485). Government support of broad participation in local decision making has served as a measure of defence against the powerful abusing the vulnerable (Heller, 2000: 485). Not having a means by which the vulnerable can participate in decision making develops a system whereby the vulnerable can be repeatedly abused.

⁸ Some of these principals are outlined in the Manila Declaration on People's Participation and Sustainable Development. The Manila Declaration on People's Participation and Sustainable Development, the manifesto of people-centred development, states that the aim of participation for the people is:

To exercise their sovereignty and assume responsibility for the development of themselves and their communities, the people must control their own resources, have access to relevant information, and have the means to hold the officials of government accountable. (Korten, 1990: 218 in Roodt, 1996: 318)

The Manila Declaration presents four public participation principles:

1. *Sovereignty resides with the people, the real actors of positive change.*
2. *The role of government is to enable citizens towards meeting their own agendas.*
3. *The citizens must control resources, have access to information and be able to hold government accountable.*
4. *Assistants to the people in development must support the people's agendas not vis. versa*

(Davids et al., 2009: 112)

Without participatory processes marginalised groups might have insufficient capacity, opportunity or legitimacy to engage in governance⁹ and would not be able to ensure their needs are met. This lack of opportunity and unjust systematic abuse of power presents a case of structural violence which increases their vulnerability.

Political and developmental reasoning behind adopting a participatory approach to development interventions has been justified in terms of the promotion of substantive democracy (Heller, 2000; Weiss, 2000; Kaplan, 1994; and Ayers, 2006), the promotion of substantive freedoms (Sen, 1999) and protection against structural violence (Galtung, 1969). All of these motivations fit into the humanist paradigm where people “decide for themselves what constitutes a ‘better life’.” (Davids et al., 2009: 17). Participation is key to this approach (Davids et al., 2009: 17). This thesis is situated within this people-centred approach to development.

3.3.3. Participation

The participatory approaches originate from a global movement from ineffective centralised governmental control to people’s access to and control over resources needed to protect livelihoods (Davids et al., 2009: 318).

Participation can be seen as a principle, a hierarchical process, a practice, a tool for achieving stated objectives or an outcome of a change programme (Hayward et al., 2004 in Diallo, 2007). Participatory approaches can be top-down or bottom up (Chambers, 2005: 88). Bottom up participatory processes empower citizens, including the vulnerable, to influence how development resources are used (Davids et al., 2009: 111). One of the main functions of participation within the humanist paradigm is conscientisation (Davids et al., 2009:111). This involves people becoming critically aware of contradictions in

9 “Governance comprises the mechanisms, processes and institutions through which collective decisions are made and implemented, the public groups and communities pursue their visions, articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their difference” (UNDP, 1997:1 in Davids et al., 2009:65)

their lives through participation and dialogue; which drives them to become active, transformative, creative and militant subjects of their lives (Davids et al., 2009: 315). This function of participation rings true with Burkey's definition of participation as a, "process, whereby people learn to take charge of their own lives and solve their own problems..." (Burkey, 1993: 56 in Davids et al., 2009: 119) However there are benefits and costs involved in using a participatory development approach. Davids' description of these can be found in Appendix B.

Participatory development literature provides certain tools and guidelines that allow the willing development worker and the willing community member to engage in a level of participatory development and practice that can build capacities. These tools include ladders describing different types of participation, (examples include Arnstein, 1969; Chambers, 2005; Stoker 2006 and Pretty, 1995) and guidelines describing the reasons people participate in certain ways, an example being Stoker's (2006) model of participatory practice.

Arnstein (1969), Chambers (2005), Stoker (2006) and Davids et al. (2009) describe different degrees or intentions of participation. Some of these degrees are arranged hierarchically in the form of ladders of participation. Arnstein describes eight different forms of participation in the form of a ladder. These different forms are defined in detail below (Arnstein, 1969).

Stoker (2006) provides a model for participatory practice that attempts to overcome inequalities within the practice. Stoker presents five factors that support understanding and practice of participatory development in the form of the CLEAR model. This model will be discussed further in the recommendations section.

According to Keough participatory development can be used as a tool to manipulate people into engaging in pre-determined processes or it can be used to empower people towards democracy and sustainable development in

modern times (Keough, 1998: 187). There are different forms of participation which is why it is critical to be specific about what is meant by participatory approaches in terms of intended process and outcomes. The observable indicators of the participatory process are a focus of this thesis. These different and at times, negative uses of participation have led to certain central criticisms of participatory approaches. See Cooke and Kothari (2004) for an in-depth discussion of the potential tyrannical outcomes of participatory approaches.

3.3.4. Arnstein's Ladder of Citizen Participation

Arnstein's ladder of citizen participation was the basis for my thesis. There are eight levels and at each level the public contribution increases incrementally in terms of scope and depth. These eight levels are Manipulation, Therapy, Informing, Consultation, Placation, Partnership, Delegated Power and Citizen Control.

Arnstein describes the first two levels, *Manipulation and Therapy* as *non-participation* with the purpose of allowing the outside development agents to 'educate' or 'cure' those affected by the programme (Arnstein, 1969: 217). These two levels will thus not be used in this study.

The next two levels, *Informing and Consultation*, are described by Arnstein as forms of 'tokenism'. Here participants are informed and can voice their opinions, but there is no guarantee that their contributions will be used by the powerful external agents and "hence no assurance of the change of the status quo" (Arnstein, 1969: 217). The transformative nature of participatory development thus is not fully actualised at these levels.

The last three levels in the ladder *Partnership, Delegated Power and Citizen Control*, move on from tokenism to an "increasing degree of decision-making clout" (Arnstein, 1969:217). Davids et al. argues that these last three levels are the most appropriate forms of participation whereby participants have increasing levels of control over the developmental process (Davids et al.,

2009: 118). At the last level of Citizen Control, participants have full control of governance of the programme (Arnstein, 1969: 223).

Six levels of Arnstein's ladder are used within this thesis: Informing, Consultation, Placation, Partnership, Delegated Power and Citizen Control. Each of these is described in detail.

Informing

Arnstein describes this level as a form of participation where there is a one-way, top-down flow of information in which the public is informed of their rights, responsibilities and opinions. She identifies that "informing citizens of their rights, responsibilities, and options can be the most important first step toward legitimate citizen participation". (Arnstein, 1969: 219) She warns that often the emphasis is on one-way information flow from official to citizen, at a late stage of the planning, without feedback channel or negotiation possibilities for the citizens. (Arnstein, 1969: 219) When this happens beneficiaries can't contribute to the programme plans in a way that would make the programme better suit their needs and thus be "for their benefit". (Arnstein, 1969: 219) She explores other elements of this level of participation. (Arnstein, 1969: 219)

Consultation

Arnstein describes this level as the power-holders' asking for the citizens' opinions, but warns that "if Consulting them is not combined with other modes of participation, this rung of the ladder is still a sham since it offers no assurance that citizen concerns and ideas will be taken into account" (Arnstein, 1969: 219).

Examples of common methods of consultation include “attitude surveys¹⁰, neighborhood meetings, and public hearings.” (Arnstein, 1969: 219) She explains that at this level “People are primarily perceived as statistical abstractions, and participation is measured by how many come to meetings, take brochures home, or answer a questionnaire. What citizens achieve in all this activity is that they have “participated in participation.” And what power-holders achieve is the evidence that they have gone through the required motions of involving ‘those people’.” (Arnstein, 1969: 219)

Placation

Arnstein explains that at this level beneficiaries “begin to have some degree of influence” though this influence may only be symbolic/ tokenism. (Arnstein, 1969: 220) A few handpicked members of the public are appointed to committees as representatives, while tokenism is still the main motivation for the powerful. (Arnstein, 1969: 220) A few members of the Target population are selected to be representatives on the external agent’s terms. These representatives do not represent all of different groups within the Target population. Certain groups of the Target population can be excluded from the participatory process. Usually Targets of the programme simply “rubber-stamp” external development agent’s plans. Targets of the programme’s contributions are not reflected in the final policy or plans for the programme. Structures are in place for participation but these are ambiguous and complicated resulting in participants giving a large amount of time and energy to participation without this resulting in their being able to influence the programme.

10 Arnstein describes the dangers of attitude surveys: that beneficiaries are asked their opinions on a variety of problems but see no meaningful delivery of solutions and that these surveys would not provide meaningful opinions without further beneficiary input. ‘In some communities, residents are so annoyed that they are demanding a fee for research interviews.’ (Arnstein, 1969: 219) If beneficiaries do not know what their options are they might chose the most appealing option but the most useful option might still remain with them. If there is no meaningful dialogue this option will not surface.’ (Arnstein, 1969: 219)

Partnership

At this level Arnstein describes a redistribution of power through negotiation between benefactors and beneficiaries or the programme Target group. (Arnstein, 1969: 221) This results in: shared “planning and decision-making responsibilities through such structures as joint policy boards, planning committees and mechanisms for resolving impasses” (Arnstein, 1969:221). Once these negotiations have taken place and agreements about responsibility or “ground-rules” have been made, these agreements or ground-rules “are not subject to unilateral change” (Arnstein, 1969:221).

At this level, unlike the level of Delegated Power, there are more Targets than Outsiders on the decision making committees. The Targets have the dominant decision making power. Like the level of Delegated Power the Outsiders have final veto power over decisions made. The representatives of the Targets of the interventions are held accountable to the broader Target group (Arnstein, 1969: 221).

The Targets’ contributions to the programme at this level are seen as buy-in rather than cost reduction by the Outsiders. There is evidence of dialogical decision making as well as shared responsibility and shared ownership of the process. Arnstein explains that this level is best achieved when programme Targets have the resources to pay their leaders and to pay for technical expertise. In her example of this level the community group pays their leaders and advisors and technical experts through funds provided by the benefactor (Arnstein, 1969:221).

Accountability is a critical element of the level of Partnership. Within the participatory process not all of the Targets would be able to communicate directly with outsiders, they need spokespeople or representatives. So the power relations and effectiveness of the communication between the Targets, their representatives and the outsiders impacts on how the Targets participate in the intervention. Accountability of Target representatives to the Targets is an important element in the measurement of participation. The indicators for the level of Partnership strongly involve the accountability of Target

representatives to the rest of the Target group. Arnstein, however, is vague in her description of this accountability and I chose to clarify this concept by identifying two distinctly different forms of accountability. I presented these as two different indicators for the level of Partnership in the instrument that I developed to gauge the perceptions of the levels of participation.

According to Davids et al., accountability of the powerful to those they represent concerns systems of reporting and answerability regarding issues of funds and programme successes and failures. (Davids et al., 2009:55) Accountability is a mechanism to prevent the abuse of power and involves putting checks and oversight systems in place. The term accountability is vague, evasive and confusing (Schedler, 1999:13). Two aspects of accountability that are useful in identifying levels of participation are Schedler's terms of accountability enforcement and accountability transparency. Accountability transparency involves Target representatives reporting back to those they represent on what they know about the programme concerned (Schedler, 1999:13). Accountability enforcement means that the Targets have the power to subject their representatives to sanctions if they do not act desirably (Schedler, 1999:13).

Delegated Power

The public acquires the dominant decision making over a particular plan or programme. There is a degree of public control and power. Arnstein describes the features of this level as follows: "Negotiations between citizens and public officials ... result(s) in citizens achieving dominant decision-making authority over a particular plan or programme." (Arnstein, 1969: 222) The Targets have specific and limited powers and responsibilities, e.g. "policy-making; hiring and firing; issuing subcontracts for building, buying, or leasing." (Arnstein, 1969: 223) At this level, when there are differences to be resolved "power holders need to start the bargaining process". (Arnstein, 1969: 222)

The Targets have the majority of seats on decision making boards and can thus “assure accountability of the programme to them”. (Arnstein, 1969: 222) Any decisions and programme processes are reported to the beneficiaries. This makes the process more bottom up and allows the beneficiaries to be more agentic within the programme. This level of accountability links to three of the seven core values of participation presented by The International Association for Public Participation (IAPP2 2002): “The public participation process communicates the interest and meets the process needs of all participants”; “The public participation process communicates to participants how their input affects decisions”; “The public participation process provides participants with information they need to participate in a meaningful way.” (Davids et al., 2009: 112)

One of the four public participation principles presented in the Manila Declaration¹¹ of 1989 present accountability and public control as key to people-centred development: “To exercise their sovereignty and assume responsibility for the development of themselves and their communities, the people must control their own resources, have access to relevant information and have means to hold the officials of government accountable” (Davids et al., 2009:112) Thus if organisations or governments claim to adopt a participatory approach in line with the Manila Declaration the Targets of the intervention must have a system to hold the power holders and each other accountable.

The difference between this level and Citizen Control is that the benefactors have the final veto in decisions pertaining to the programme plans and implementation and that at this level the benefactors have only specific and limited powers and responsibilities (Arnstein, 1969: 222) whereas at the level of Citizen Control the beneficiaries have full power of governance of the programme without the “influence of the powerful” (Arnstein, 1969: 223).

Citizen Control

Arnstein (1969) in Davids et al., (2009: 223) describes this level as follows: “public has the degree of power (or control) which guarantees that participants ... can govern a programme or institution, be in full charge of policy or managerial aspects, and be able to negotiate the conditions under which “outsiders” may change them.” According to Arnstein a good model of this phase is where there are no intermediaries between the participants and the source of funds. (Davids et al., 2009: 223)

As this is the highest level of Arnstein’s ladder of participation it can be assumed that Arnstein’s definition of participation would be fully actualised. Arnstein defines full participation at this level as: “...a categorical term for citizen power. It is the strategy by which the have-nots join in determining how information is shared, goal and policies are set, tax resources are allocated, programmes are operated, and benefits like contracts and patronage are parceled out.” (Arnstein, 1969: 216)

Arnstein (1969: 216) describes citizen power as a vehicle for beneficiaries to “induce significant social reform” whereby they can take their share in the riches of the society. Coetzee, (in Davids et al., 2009: 105) explains that one of the principles linked to people centered and thus participatory development is that development acts as a transformative vehicle for the improvement of people’s lives and leads to improved social justice, participatory decision making and sustainable development. The public become “authors of their own development” (Coetzee, 2001:122-126 in Davids et al., 2009: 105).

Citizen power means that Outsider changes must be negotiated with the participants and the programme is accountable to the participants (Arnstein, 1969: 223). Arnstein describes increasing Citizen Control as a move on from citizen participation as tokenism to “increasing degree of decision-making clout” (Arnstein, 1969:217).

3.3.5. Criticism of the Participatory Approach

Using participatory techniques does not eliminate the danger of perpetuating structural violence nor does it guarantee improved substantive democracy through increasing the impact of the disadvantaged in state governance through civil society representation (Keough, 1998: 187). In this section I critique the participatory development approach on two points: sincerity of the intent and equity of power in participation.

In terms of sincerity of intent, Arnstein and others¹² critique some attempts at participation for being manipulative or placatory without transformative or empowerment intentions (Arnstein, 1969). Rahnema reminds us that by definition participation can be "...either transitive or intransitive; moral, amoral or immoral; either forced or free; either manipulative or spontaneous" (Rahnema in Sachs 1992:116 in Davids: 2009, 116).

Another concern is the elite among of the Targets becoming the dominant participants in the participatory processes leading to the exclusion of the less powerful. This concern about equity in development interventions involves power relations between those who struggle to meet their needs and those who have resources to help fulfil these needs (Diallo, 2007: 3-4). According to Diallo these power relations can be understood in terms of the degree of "influence, ownership, power in social change programmes, and by examining of both beneficiaries' and benefactors' *opinions* [my emphasis] on the participatory nature of communication processes in these programmes" (Diallo, 2007: 3-4). This directly informed the design of my instrument.

Legitimate participation of citizens in local-level decision making is often difficult to achieve because of the monopolization of power by local elites who use tradition as an excuse to maintain the exclusion of the majority or less powerful from sharing in decision making (Roodt, 1996: 323). Roodt warns that at a local level people can form monopolising power groups which inhibit the participation of minority or less powerful people (Roodt, 1996: 323). This

¹² Hayward et al., (2004) in Diallo (2007), Kothari (2001) and Chambers (2005)

thesis addresses the perspectives of participation from both the points of view of the benefactors and beneficiaries.

Roodt demonstrates how in the case of South Africa's Bantustans and other African examples, participation was used to legitimise top-down action and allowed corruption and domination of the poor (Roodt, 1996: 314 - 322). Roodt concludes with pertinent questions relating to participation, the one which is central to this thesis is "What do we mean by 'participatory development' in South Africa? Is it a legitimating exercise for top-down implementation, is it a transformative exercise, and at what level should it occur?" (Roodt, 1996:323).

Linked to this is Kapoor's (2002) concern regarding the potential for the exclusion of certain participants' contributions and gains within the participatory processes due to communicative and power barriers and inequalities. Heller (2002: 489) discusses extra-constitutional authorities evolving from social inequalities as a potential barrier to the exercise of civil and political rights. If applied in a participatory setting, have-nots might not have the capacity, or be willing to discuss their wants and needs due to power issues with outsiders and elites within the participation process.

There are many forms and descriptions of participation (e.g. ¹ See Pretty et al., 2005, Arnstein, 1969 and Kumar, 2002), some of which have been heavily criticised (Cook and Kothari 2001, Stiefel and Wolfe 1994 and Roodt 2001). Confusion caused by these different forms of participation and perceived negative effects of interventions that claim to use a participatory approach have called the usefulness of participatory approaches into question (Cook and Kothari, 2001; Stiefel and Wolfe, 1994 and Roodt, 2001).

If participatory processes are framed effectively within paradigms relating to development as freedom, and working against structural violence, techniques, principles and monitoring frameworks might be developed such that these participatory processes may result in improved citizen control, decreased structural violence and deepened substantive democracy.

3.3.6. Measurement in Participation

It is clear from the literature that many authors have explored the evolution of participatory approaches, strategies for participation, and different types of participation, but few have addressed how this participation might be measured. Measurement is important in determining whether applying participatory practices actually results in the changes that the practices claim to be able to make (Rossi and Lipsey, et. al 2004, 3). Through developing a tool to measure how participation is being perceived I am developing a tool to monitor how participatory practices are being implemented from the perspectives of the parties involved. The tool can be used to monitor programme process. If a participatory approach was included in the programme policy with set outcomes and performance criteria the tool could be used to ascertain whether the programme is operating according to the set standards (Rossi and Lipsey, et. al 2004, 171).

Civil society's role in governance is explained, but whether civil society truly represents and empowers the extremely disadvantaged through their participation within its structures is a contentious issue (Chambers, 2005: 93-97 and Cooke and Kothari, 2001). The haphazard use of participation does not guarantee equity or social transformation. It is important to understand how to use and control the participatory processes to promote empowerment rather than oppression. Tools that measure participation will help the development practitioner measure the effectiveness of participatory interventions.

Chambers (2005, 101-105) explains that various understandings of participation occur within the literature. Authors have designed models to compare and rank these different definitions of participation on ladders or continuums with manipulative forms of participation at the one end to Citizen Control at the other end (Chambers 2005, 101-105).

Chambers (2005, 105) advocates that groups involved in development interventions should define participation for themselves or even invent their own ladder. He also advocates the use of ladders in participatory practices to sensitise role-players to power dynamics and to promote general consensus around defining words used for activities and relationships. He states that this would “reduce pretence and hypocrisy and improve practice” (Chambers, 2005: 106 - 107).

Dauids et al. (2009: 114-121) argues that participation differs in terms of how it is understood and how it is implemented. He refers to Pretty et al.'s (1995) typologies of the different degrees of participation and Oakley and Marsden's modes of public participation through which a community might “move from a less desirable to more desirable situation” along a continuum (Dauids et al., 2009: 119). Similarly, Arnstein presents a typology of eight levels of participation with increasing levels of citizen power from manipulation to Citizen Control in the form of a ladder of participation.

3.3.7. Higher Levels of Participation are Not Necessarily the Ideal

Whether participatory approach at the “citizen control” end of the spectrum is always the most effective approach to improve capabilities and quality of life of the Targets of interventions is also debated in the literature (Chambers, 2005). This is in line with Chamber's argument which advocates the use of ladders in participatory practice. He warns that it is dangerous and inaccurate to assume that pushing for participatory practices at ever higher rungs on a ladder would necessarily best benefit Targets of interventions (Chambers, 2005: 107). He notes that at times lower levels of participation are more appropriate than higher levels and that sequencing i.e. starting at lower levels and moving to higher levels, is needed at other times (Chambers, 2005: 107).

Equity within participatory practices, especially at higher levels on the ladder, is a contentious issue (Chambers, 2005: 107). Chambers explains that even at higher levels people might not be participating equitably. At any of the levels of participation the process should be critically considered in order to guard against a seemingly people-centred process that gives licence to

powerful Targets manipulating and exploiting weaker Targets. For this reason it is critical to monitor levels of equity by for example checking for exploitation by asking Targets why they are participating and investigating resources Targets are asked to give to the project relative to the resources they have. Potential tools to address equity in participation are discussed in the recommendations section of this thesis.

The focus of this thesis is not to place one definition over another in terms of their usefulness in achieving humanist developmental goals, although this is briefly discussed in Chapter 6. The focus is to move towards the creation of a participatory measurement instrument to improve communication between Targets and outsiders in participatory interventions so that these interventions might be more effectively implemented and development within the humanist paradigm might be promoted.

In this thesis the focus is on measuring the Targets and Outsiders *perceptions* of level of participation of the Targets, rather than the measurement of the level of participation of the Targets through objective means. Chambers notes that gauging the type of participation understood to be being used in practice would “reduce pretence and hypocrisy and improve practice” (Chambers, 2005: 106 - 107). The perception of participation is critical here. How participation happens on paper, the degree to which Targets of interventions are said to influence a programme and how much they feel or perceive themselves to influence a programme can be very different. The way in which both Targets and Outsiders feel or perceive the Targets to be influencing the programme are important to understand and measure because it is through these perceptions that true shifts in power take place.

Without effective management instruments and insufficient insight into the measurable elements of participation control, the participatory process is limited. However if participatory approaches could be effectively measured, monitoring and evaluation systems could be implemented so as to develop a participatory process where the outcomes are more predictable.

If the level at which participation is perceived can be measured and the outcomes of the interventions that claim to use a participatory approach can be measured we are able to see whether there is a connection between the level of perceived participation and the effectiveness of the development initiative. This will help to contribute to our understanding about which types of participation are useful, and under what circumstances, to achieve development goals.

In order to show the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of participatory approaches in practice it is necessary to understand what kind of participatory approach is being used. A common understanding of what the participatory process involves can improve communication between Outsiders and Targets. Therefore gauging the perception of the type of participation is helpful in achieving humanist development goals.

3.3.8. Indicators

In order to measure the above concepts, indicators are developed. The indicators are developed from the measurable elements in Arnstein's description of the levels. An indicator is the result of the conceptualisation process that allows us to be specific about the concepts that are being studied (Babbie and Mouton, 1998: 111). The function of indicators is to indicate "the presence or absence of the concept we are studying" (Babbie and Mouton, 1998: 111). Gilbert describes indicators as a "measurement that aims to measure the concept accurately" (Gilbert, 2008: 31). Relationships between concepts are not being tested for so dependent and independent variables are not developed.

3.3.9. Targets and Outsiders

Gauging the perspectives of Outsiders and Targets was an important element of this study. As described above one of the functions of participation is improving communication between stakeholders. The tool designed through this thesis can be used in NGO settings where the powerful stakeholders

might be funders or NGO management and those affected by the decisions of the powerful might be the recipients of the NGO's services. In people-centred development the understanding of participation involves the understanding of the interaction between the powerful and those affected by decisions. It is important to understand both perspectives and check whether there is a similar understanding or how differences in understandings affect the participatory process. The differences or similarities in these understandings are linked to the communication. Understanding these perspectives is likely to improve communication. To understand the perspectives it is important to know who the role-players are and what their roles are.

The terms benefactor and beneficiary are commonly used in the participatory literature. I have replaced the term benefactor with Outsider and the term beneficiary with Target because the terms are less patronising. It is important at the beginning of each assessment of participation, to establish who the Targets of interventions are and who the outsiders are.

3.3.9.1. Targets

In her tool Arnstein often refers to "the public", the "have-nots" and citizens. The term "*Targets of the programme*" will be used in this thesis. The Targets of the programme would be those who as a group have a common need that the programme aims to address. There are a variety of Targets within this school building programme. These include teachers, school governing body members, parents, community members who are not parents and crèche staff. Samples from most of these Target groups were interviewed but due to time constraints and for the purpose of a more in-depth analysis of a smaller sample within the research report which has size limitations, only teachers were analysed in the Target group.

3.3.9.2. Outsiders

Arnstein (1969) refers to state agencies, community representative groups, planners, architects, politicians, bosses, programme leaders, citizen groups

and political representatives as the powerful. In this research the term 'Outsiders' was used. The term 'Outsiders' has fewer power connotations and describes this group pragmatically and succinctly.

The terms Outsider and Target are explained to the respondents during the interviews as follows: The Targets are the people who have a developmental need that the programme legitimately should be addressing. Without the Targets the programme would not exist. The Outsiders are explained as those who come from outside to assist in the programme but the focus of the programme is not to help them.

3.3.10. Sub-questions to the Central Research Question

Through the process of operationalising the central research question certain sub-questions were developed. Answering these questions will help answer the central research question.

1. What indicators can be extracted from Arnstein (1969) at each level of participation she describes?
2. What are the most useful indicators in establishing the level of participation on Arnstein's ladder?
3. What are the levels of participation of the Targets perceived by the Targets individually and as a group within the programme? Is there convergence or divergence within the Target group?
4. What are the levels of participation of the Targets perceived by the Outsiders individually and as a group within the programme? Is there convergence or divergence within the Outsider group?
5. Is there convergence or divergence between the Targets' and Outsiders' perceptions of the levels of participation of the Targets?

With these questions in mind I now turn to the methodology.

Chapter Four Methodology

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter I discuss the methods used to address the research question and associated sub-questions. The overall design of the study, which is qualitative and descriptive, is explained. The data collection methodologies used include in-depth interviewing, participant observation and collection of secondary data. I documented each step of data collection and analysis with care. A summary of my analytical processes and procedures is provided here. The ethical procedures followed are also described.

4.2. Overall Design

One of the objectives of this research is to operationalise Arnstein's ladder of participation by developing indicators for each level. Another objective is to use these indicators, and an interview schedule based on these indicators, to place respondents' perspectives of the Targets' positions on a ladder of participation. On achieving these objectives I was able to deduce which indicators were useful in placing respondents' perspectives of the Targets' positions on the ladder. The final objective was to design an instrument with which to gauge the level of Targets' participation as perceived by respondents in a development initiative, which claims to use a participatory approach. The interview schedule and indicators form the instrument.

This is a qualitative study. Babbie and Mouton (2001: 271) describe certain features of qualitative research. A number of these are evident in this thesis, for example, the research takes place in the natural environment of the subjects of the study, the emphasis is on the insiders' perspectives, and the aim is to develop an in-depth understanding of the events and phenomena. (Babbie and Mouton, 2001: 271).

The study is classified as descriptive research (Babbie and Mouton, 2001: 80 - 81) because participatory patterns are described and better ways to describe and measure these patterns evolved during the study. The research does not address the reasons for the occurrence of phenomena, or attempt to show causality between the phenomena under study, so it cannot be called explanatory research (Babbie and Mouton, 2001: 80 - 81).

Evaluative research is a form of applied research that explores whether an activity 'accomplishes its objectives' (Neuman, 2006: 543). Evaluative research asks whether an activity or programme works. In my research I developed an instrument to measure perceptions of participation. My research and the instrument aim to contribute to evaluative research. This instrument can then be used when a researcher wishes to establish whether programmes that claim to use a participatory approach actually do so in the eyes of the various stakeholders.

I designed and tested an instrument in order to place perceptions of the level of participation of Targets on a ladder of participation. One methodology was employed to develop the instrument and another to test the instrument. Both methodologies have data collection and data analysis components.

4.3. A Note on Research Ethics

I applied Sieber's ethics principals of voluntary informed consent, privacy, confidentiality and anonymity. I made sure that I was aware of and minimised risk of harming vulnerable populations and attempted to maximise the benefits to parties involved in the research. (Sieber, 1998: 127 - 155)

Before each interview the respondents were informed of the purpose of the research, what it would be used for and who might read the results. They were asked whether they were voluntarily participating in the study and to sign a consent form. These forms were translated into Afrikaans for the Afrikaans speaking respondents. (See Appendix F.)

The first names of the respondents have not been used in this thesis. Senior staff members and professionals are not identifiable by their position. This is to protect their anonymity and to allay risks of friction or withdrawal of funds should any party make inflammatory statements. I was able to anticipate these risks because I paid careful attention to the underlying dynamics amongst the role players. In interviews with two or more respondents, they agreed to keep what was said in the interview confidential.

4.4. Methods of data collection

While in-depth interviews were the main method of data collection, several other methods were used to gain the background information necessary for preparing an interview schedule. These included meetings with key informants, participant observation and consulting documentary sources. In this section the methods used to collect background information are explored. This is followed by an explanation of in-depth interviewing and the interview schedule used and of the piloting process and sampling techniques that relate to the interviewing process.

4.4.1. Methods used to collect background information

I had two background meetings, one with the programme leader from the IDT and another with a senior member of the school staff, who had been at the school for years

I also attended various meetings as a participant observer. These included three staff meetings, three programme committee meetings, two meetings in which parents were briefed about the school building programme, a school governing body meeting and a contract tender meeting. At times I sat at the table with the participants of the meeting, and at others I was in the audience. Babbie and Mouton (2001: 293) define this form of data collection as observation because the researcher is part of the group being studied. Following Babbie and Mouton's (2001: 294) advice, I took detailed notes

during the meetings, and reflected on the meetings afterwards. I recorded the meetings with the permission of the attendees.

Archival and documentary sources were also used. These included collections of newspaper articles about the programme, minutes of meetings, records of agreements between the parties in the programme, architect presentations and plans, correspondence between the school and the DoE, reports on the school and IDT's annual reports.

The various meetings, archival and documentary sources helped me to orientate to the field, develop a holistic understanding of the school and programme, gather information to support the development of the interview schedule, build relationships with key stakeholders, and select suitable interviewees for the research sample. Furthermore, the meetings with IDT representatives helped me understand how their institution conceptualises and applies participatory development. One outcome of these meetings was that perceptions of the level of participation might differ at different stages of a programme. I then focused on one point in the school building programme: the planning and implementation of the building process. The focus on this stage of the process was maintained throughout the interviews and analysis.

4.4.2. In-depth Interviews

Face-to-face in-depth interviewing was the primary means of data collection. The type of information I needed was too complex to be elicited through a structured interview. Bauman and Adair (1992: 10-11) note that face-to-face in-depth interviewing combines the richness of qualitative open-ended responses and the focus of a structured interview guide. The interviews I conducted were semi-structured. I focused the interview using the key questions in the interview schedule, but I was flexible in the order in which I asked the questions and how I probed for further information (Bauman and Adair, 1992: 10-11).

The questions were linked to specific indicators, which in turn were linked to levels of participation as described by Arnstein (1969). The questions were designed to elicit evidence of the indicators of the levels of participation. Some of the evidence used to support certain indicators didn't stem directly from questions in the interview schedule, but rather from responses to unplanned questions. This is a characteristic of semi-structured interviewing (Bauman and Adair, 1992: 10 -11).

The interview schedule was based on indicators that I had derived from Arnstein's description of the levels of participation. The most useful indicators were identified through the interviews and analysis. They helped answer the first sub-question of the research question: *What indicators can be extracted at each level of participation that Arnstein describes?* and the second sub-research question: *What are the most useful indicators in establishing the level of participation on Arnstein's ladder?* Once the most useful indicators were established they were used to answer the third, fourth and fifth sub-questions which relate to the respondents' perceptions of the Targets' levels of participation at the different levels of the ladder of participation. This is explained in more detail in the data analysis section below.

In testing the usefulness of the indicators, I also tested which parts of Arnstein's descriptions were the most useful in locating perceptions on the ladder. In order to critically examine the usefulness of the ladder it was important to extract the most useful elements of Arnstein's descriptions. For this reason I have not included the work of other authors in the development of this tool except where they clarify concepts underdeveloped by Arnstein. In the discussion I critique the utility of an instrument based solely on Arnstein's ladder of participation. The value of other authors is mentioned in this discussion.

The initial questions in the interview schedule were discussed with the IDT representative and a senior teacher at the Klapmuts Primary School in order to establish what terminology and concepts would be understood by the respondents. The IDT representative and the teacher had been involved in the

school building programme for sometime, so they were a satisfactory choice. Weller's technique of exploratory interviewing and item generation were employed here (Weller, 1998: 367). I used this technique described by Weller (1994) to word the questions appropriately for the sample population and create what Weller calls a 'semantic domain'.

I used Weller's technique of free-recall listing in the background meetings. He describes this technique as one in which the informants are asked an open-ended question so as to gain a set of comprehensive sample of items (Weller, 1998: 368). This technique was used to establish who the Outsiders and Targets were, and to elicit examples of occurrences that provided data about perceptions of participation drawn from the programme history. I followed Weller's advice and began with broad, general questions in order to develop a foundation for questions about specific indicators (Weller, 1998: 368). These questions also built the trust that was necessary if the interviewees were to answer truthfully.

In order to improve instrument validity (Babbie and Mouton, 2001: 217) the interview schedule was translated into Afrikaans, checked and translated back into English by two independent Afrikaans speakers. Most of the interviews with the teachers were conducted in Afrikaans. The interviews with the Outsiders were conducted in English. I am bilingual as I speak both English and Afrikaans fluently. I translated the quotations from the interviews that are presented in the body of this thesis.

The interview schedule was refined through a piloting process. I then analysed the data and decided which indicators were most useful in determining the level the respondents' perceptions of the Targets participation¹³. (I shall describe the piloting process and my analysis of the

¹³ Not all of the indicators derived from Arnstein's descriptions of the levels of participation were useful. Some had to be dropped and others adjusted to design a user-friendly unambiguous set of indicators that is relevant to the South African context and can be used to place respondent's perceptions on the ladder.

data later.) Only the questions that informed these indicators are included in the final tool. These can be found in Appendix C.

4.4.2.1 Sampling

Purposive sampling was undertaken. Babbie and Mouton (2001: 166) explain that purposive sampling is appropriate when the researcher has a basic knowledge of the population and a good understanding of the research questions and purpose of the study. I undertook purposive sampling because there were very few potential candidates and only the candidates who were involved in the participatory elements of the programme could constructively inform the development of the tool. Only the sample that I selected could fulfil the purpose of providing information on the levels of participation of the programme Targets. I was interested in the perceptions of Outsiders and Targets.

The Outsiders were the architect, engineer and quantity surveyor involved in the building of the school, the IDT representatives, who were the programme managers and the representative from the South African Department of Education, who were funding the programme. While numerous Outsiders were linked to the six programme professionals were actively involved in and knowledgeable about the programme, so all six were interviewed.

(Interview with senior staff member at Klappmuts Primary School, 2009)

Interview with the IDT Regional Programme Manager and Klappmuts Mud Schools Programme Managers in April 2009

There were three Target groups with large populations. These three were the teachers, the parents and the community members who were not parents. The Targets were the teachers at the school at which the intervention tool place. The community members and parents interviewed initially seemed to be an appropriate part of the sample group but after the interviews took place it was clear that they had insufficient knowledge of the programme and were not

sufficiently involved in the programme to contribute meaningfully to the research. Consequently, they were removed from the study.

I selected a cross-sectional sample of teachers in order to avoid selecting an atypical sample from the population (Babbie and Mouton, 2001: 170). This was done by using a form of stratified purposive sampling within the teacher population. The different strata included junior, middle and senior phase teachers as well as teachers who served on committees and others who did not. This provided me with a mix of teacher respondents based on the age groups that they taught and their involvement in decision making groups in the school such as the school governing body and the school building programme.

I had meetings with the programme implementation manager from IDT and the deputy headmaster of the Klappmuts Primary School to orientate myself and to gather information about the programme background and process. This helped me identify the most appropriate respondents. Targets needed to have some knowledge of the building programme in order for me to test their level of participation in it.¹⁴

Of the 34 respondents I initially interviewed and transcribed, 15 constituted the final sample for this study. Six Outsiders and three teachers were individually interviewed; a further six teachers were interviewed in groups of two or three. Considering the group and individual interviews the total number of interviews that were used in the final sample is 12. In six of these teachers were interviewed and in the six others, the Outsiders were interviewed.

¹⁴ The initial interviews with three community members and 11 parents from Klappmuts revealed that they were either not sufficiently knowledgeable about the building programme to comment on it or they were reluctant to answer questions that could, in their view, jeopardise the completion of the new school and therefore they were excluded from the study.

4.4.2.2. Pilot

The interview schedule was piloted with three respondents: one IDT representative and two teachers. In this way the interview was piloted with representatives from the various Target and Outsider groups. The following insights were gained from the pilot:

- Examples from the field were needed to elicit realistic responses from the interviewees.
- Some of the concepts are quite abstract so first talking about participation and asking questions which were not directly linked to the indicators gave me insight into the respondents' experiences and established a platform to progress to questions which related directly to the indicators. The earlier questions helped respondents answer the later questions.
- The aim of the instrument is to gauge perceptions. I realised that elements of the initial interview schedule were erroneously designed to focus on objective facts. I made appropriate adjustments so that all of the questions were aimed at gauging perceptions only.
- I found that there was a lot of frustration regarding the programme and in order to keep the interview short and focused I needed to concentrate on the interview schedule and discuss the aim of the interview with the respondents before the interview started.
- I removed certain portions of the interview because the information had already been gathered in the background meetings and was making the interview unreasonably long.

I used the information from the pilot to revise the interview schedule which was then used in the rest of the interviews. The number of questions was reduced and the remaining questions refined. This interview schedule was used to test which indicators would be useful in the instrument.

Once the interview schedule was piloted the rest of the interviewing took place. In this way the instrument was fully tested on the school building programme. It is important to note that this research process involved a full test of the instrument rather than only a pilot. Indicators were refined through

the analysis process. The instrument was designed as a generic instrument to be easily adapted and used on other programmes.

4.5. Methods of Analysis

The data analysis is primarily informed by Miles and Huberman (1994) and De Wet & Erasmus (2009). Data analysis was guided by Miles and Huberman's (1994: 10-12) three step iterative process of data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing and verification. In this section the initial phases of analysis will be described followed by a description of the development and application of the final indicators used in the tool.

4.5.1. Initial Phases of Analysis

Miles and Huberman (1994: 54) discuss the selective nature of analysing data from transcripts and observations. As suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994: 55) the research question and conceptual framework were used to narrow the research focus and select the relevant and useful information to analyse and produce results that answer the research question. It is acknowledged that what is seen in the transcripts is selective in terms of context, theoretical perspective, informant selectivity and observation. Considering the centrality of the researcher in this selective process it was necessary to guard against investigator bias.

De Wet and Erasmus (2005) advise the use of verification strategies and self correcting mechanisms to avoid investigator responsiveness and to increase the validity of the data and conclusions drawn (2005: 30-31). Self correction mechanisms that I employed included an inter-coder reliability check, keeping a data analysis diary and recording my reflections on each interview straight immediately after the interview took place. Recording my reflections served a similar function to Miles and Huberman's contact summary sheet. The main themes in the contact as well as new insights and speculations are recorded after each contact and inform the next interview (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 51). This process helped me to keep track of my own feelings and ideas and

be critical of these so as to avoid bias, provide a better understand the respondents¹⁵, improve the validity of judgments made about the data and avoid investigator responsiveness¹⁶.

I used various self correcting mechanisms to manage the coding categories and to check the reliability and validity of coding categories. These mechanisms included checking the reliability and validity of the merged indicators by comparing the meaning I had attached to them in the analysis phase and the meaning I had attached to them in the phase in which I had extracted the indicators to develop the interview schedule.

After the interviews were transcribed and before I began the coding process I read through the transcripts carefully and repeatedly, as advised by De Wet and Erasmus (2005: 30), to enable me to gain a better understanding of the issues arising within the interviews and further avoid investigator responsiveness.

These reflections and as well as keeping a data analysis diary and having regular reflective discussions with my supervisor were some of the techniques I employed to maintain awareness of some of the possible sources of error in data collection and analysis as advised by Boulton and Hammersley (1996: 294). Once the data was collected, the stage of in-the-field analysis came to an end.

In order to analyse the data further the recorded interviews were transcribed and imported into a computer programme called NVivo, which is a qualitative data analysis computer programme. Boulton and Hammersley (1996: 286) discuss the choices in transcription form and level of detail and how this directly relates to the purpose of the research. The purpose of this research is

¹⁵ See Boulton and Hammersley (1996: 294-295) for a detailed discussion on reflexivity and the assessment of validity.

¹⁶ See De Wet and Erasmus's (2005: 30) discussion on the usefulness of verification strategies and self correcting mechanisms to avoid investigator responsiveness.

to gain an in-depth understanding of the respondents' perceptions of participation, so I found it necessary to transcribe them verbatim. (See Appendix H for an example of this transcription.)

Once the transcripts were copied into NVivo I continued to follow Miles and Huberman's (1994: 10-12) three step iterative process of data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing and verification. I used NVivo to assist me in coding, writing reports and constructing matrixes as techniques of data reduction and display.

NVivo was very useful in the data coding process which served to reduce and display the data to enable me to draw conclusions about the data. Fielding and Lee describe the function of a code to be "to organise the text by permitting it to be divided into segments" (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 87). De Wet and Erasmus (2005: 30) describe coding as the categorising information by allocating labels to passages of texts. This fragmentation of the data (Dey, 1993: 62 in De Wet and Erasmus, 2005: 30) helps to reduce the data. (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 69 in De Wet and Erasmus, 2005: 30) Miles and Huberman's guidelines were used to design codes which they describe as meaningful categorisation of information 'embedded within a particular logic or conceptual lens' (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 56 - 57). Miles and Huberman (1994: 56 - 58) define various types of codes. The main form of coding used was *descriptive coding*, defined by Miles and Huberman (1994: 57) as a type of coding that attributes 'a class of phenomena to a text' used to summarise the data.

I used pre-defined coding categories (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 57). Seventy-nine indicators were developed exhaustively from Arnstein's descriptions of the levels of participation and used as descriptive, predefined coding categories. The indicators were linked together hierarchically through overarching coding categories called levels which, in this study, refers to the levels of participation. This is called second level coding because it demonstrates a hierarchical relationship between the coding categories. Second level is described as follows by De Wet and Erasmus (2005: 33) as

follows, “Second-level coding involves two steps: first, identify clusters and hierarchies of information and second, a deeper level of analysis during which we identify patterns and relationships in the data”. I allowed for multiple codes to be allocated to a section of text as described by De Wet and Erasmus (2005: 31).

Miles and Huberman (1994: 61) advise revision of coding to assist in data reduction so as to avoid data overload and to generate meaningful results. Fielding and Lee (1998: 101) describe the process of data reduction as a process of refinement. They describe meaning in qualitative data as ‘flexible and transitory’ and how through data reduction process these meanings are refined to produce fewer, more useful codes.

I tested this coding system on three transcripts and reviewed and refined the codes through the lens of the conceptual framework and the research questions. An interview transcript from two different Target groups i.e. a teacher and a community member’s transcripts and the transcript of an Outsider was used to test the coding system.

I used the various functions of NVivo to test, refine and manage the codes. Lee and Fielding (1998: 86 -94) discuss the process of code management whereby codes are rearranged and redundant codes are eliminated in their discussion of defining codes. The research question and conceptual framework were as always kept in mind during this process. NVivo was used to best arrange codes and the data captured within them. Refining codes involved eliminating redundant codes, merging codes, changing codes so as to retain exclusivity in the meaning of each code and renaming codes. Again this process had a data reduction function (Fielding and Lee, 1998: 86 -94). The result of this process was that the number of indicator codes was significantly reduced from 79 to 39 codes. Each code was very carefully and precisely defined so that the meaning could be shared amongst analysts in accordance with Miles and Huberman’s advice on defining codes (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 63).

These codes were then checked for inter-coder reliability to verify the reliability of the meaning of the codes (De Wet and Erasmus, 2005: 32). The research supervisor and I cross checked samples of coded transcripts to check for agreement about the meaning of the codes and chunks of information captured within the codes. A satisfactory level of agreement was reached.

The final set of 39 codes were rearranged to be more useful in assigning a respondent to a level of participation and thus more useful in answering the research question. Clusters of codes were associated with and used to identify the levels of participation. In this way the codes could be used as indicators of the levels. Once again NVivo's system of coding in trees was used to reduce and display the data. Part of data display was to develop an ordered logical hierarchical and horizontal system of codes. The tree codes and the data display system I used are presented in Appendix D. The remaining interview transcripts were then coded according to these coding categories. The data was reduced further in this way.

These coding categories were used to analyse the remainder of the interview transcripts. These coding categories were used as indicators to identify and categorise evidence and to place respondents at one of the levels of participation. The indicators serve as the data analysis component of the instrument. The indicators of the levels of participation could only be developed through the process of completing and analysing all of the interviews. Through the analysis I could ascertain which indicators worked well in the majority of the interviews. This couldn't take place before the interviews were complete. This step in the analysis can be defined as data reduction (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 11-10).

Once I established which indicators worked best in the majority of the interviews I tracked the questions that informed these indicators. The most useful questions in the interview schedule which pertained directly to the final indicators were identified. These select questions form part of the final instrument. It is important to understand that these questions are not optimal

as they were designed to inform a far cruder set of indicators, slight adjustments have been made. These questions were helpful in gathering the data used in this research. An interview schedule should be designed that better informs the final set of indicators. (See Appendix C)

The level of participation that the respondent was allocated to was the level that had the most indicators with supporting evidence that supported that level. A report was written for each respondent where evidence from the transcripts relating to each of the coding categories or indicators was presented and conclusions relating to what level the respondent was at were drawn. These reports were useful in conclusion drawing and data display (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 11-10).

4.5.2. Development of Indicators for the Final Instrument

It became apparent that certain indicators generated from certain descriptions of Arnstein's levels were useful and others were not. I abandoned those that were not useful. It was necessary to test all of the indicators to establish which were the most useful in placing respondents at a particular level.

An indicator was defined as useful if it fulfilled the following criteria:

- It was easy to measure and direct rather than vague¹⁷. Vague indicators were eliminated or merged with other indicators.
- The data gathered through this indicator was useful in determining at which level a respondents' perspective is located at. The data helped inform the researcher which codes or indicators were the most amenable to gathering reliable evidence that informed the level.
- It was often used because the evidence relating to the indicator was easy to elicit in an interview. Some indicators were excluded because they were infrequently or never used in support of a level. This might

¹⁷ Examples of vague indicator coding categories include: *In meetings answers given by Outsider to Targets' questions are irrelevant* and *external development agents have condescending and paternalistic attitudes towards Targets of the interventions*.

have been because they were confusing, ambiguous or difficult to measure.

- The indicator is worded in the positive, i.e. that a criteria can be witnessed rather than a criteria is missing. For example the indicator *Outsiders have final veto* would be used instead of *Targets do not have final veto*, or *Targets do not participate in any other way besides being informed*. Instead of allowing for negative or restrictive indicators only positive indicators of measureable occurrences have been listed in this final set of indicators. In this way the indicators work incrementally.
- It was reasonably reliable in terms of respondents' perceptions
- It provided evidence for one level and all the levels below this level
- It was relevant to the modern African context¹⁸
- It was likely that it could be replicated in other contexts other than the setting in which the study took place increasing the external validity¹⁹.

These indicators were arranged in a matrix so that respondents could easily be placed on the ladder. In this matrix the nine indicators can be used incrementally. Miles and Huberman (1994: 11) recommend the use of matrixes to assist in data display. Displaying the data in a matrix is an effective form of data analysis.

Deciding which of the data will form part of the matrix and how this data will be arranged is a process data analysis reduction (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 11). This system is better suited to the hierarchical format of a ladder of participation and was used to promote understanding of the concept to a reader.

¹⁸ Arnstein's article is based on an American case study of the urban renewal federal social programs in disadvantaged communities. Some of the terms and phenomenon she refers to are only relevant in this context and limited other context. Indicators were limited to complete, exclusive signs that could be used in South Africa in various contexts.

¹⁹ See Babbie and Mouton, 2001: 219-221 for deeper discussion on external validity and sources of external invalidity.

This set of codes was tested by applying them to the Outsiders and Targets as separate groups to decide at what level of participation the Outsider and Target perception could be located.

This refining process resulted in the exclusion of many of the elements within Arnstein's description of the levels of participation. Many of the elements of her description are impractical to measure, or ambiguous or contradictory to other elements within the level, or found in more than one level so not useful in identifying distinguishing features between the levels. The purpose of the indicators is to provide data to show distinction between the levels. This resulted in a drastically reduced number of indicators. Despite this criticism of Arnstein's model, the refined and adapted version of the indicators based on her descriptions was still useful in developing a tool to measure perceptions of participation.

The final indicators are as follows:

A. Targets are informed of programme processes

The communication is one way: from Outsiders to Targets.

B. Targets give their ideas and input to the programme when asked to by the Outsiders and their input relates to topics defined by the Outsiders. The only inputs Targets give are elicited by the Outsiders.

C. Targets express their ideas about the plans to the Outsiders through various channels and representatives at will. This indicator is concerned with the freedom and ease with which the Targets can communicate their wishes or objections to the Outsiders. This might be through Target representatives or directly. It moves from only being able to express opinions about limited factors defined by the Outsiders at the Outsiders' requests to being able to express what they want whenever they want to. This form of communication is not restricted to elicitation by the Outsiders.

D. Targets have representatives on decision making committees

The specific Targets that the investigation of the levels of participation is focused on should have representatives on decision making bodies so that they have more direct access to these bodies.

E. Targets demand accountability transparency from the Target representatives.

The Target representatives have a system for communicating what they know and their involvements in the programmes to the rest of the Targets. Targets ask and can demand answers from the Target representatives about the programme. (See the explanation of the level of Partnership above for an in-depth contextualised explanation of the different elements of accountability)

F. Targets demand accountability enforcement from the Target representatives.

Schedler et al. explain that accountability in terms of enforcement means that people have the power to subject representatives to sanctions if they do not act desirably. If there is strong evidence of Targets being very frustrated that their opinions are not being taken into consideration then this serves as evidence against this indicator.

To be able to act desirably within the level of Partnership the Target representatives must have full meeting access and some power to demand and receive their wishes and the wishes of the Targets they represent. If representatives cannot act because of restricted meeting access and limited decision making power, they cannot be asked to justify their actions. Restricted meeting access and limited decision making power are thus evidence against this indicator

In this indicator the Outsiders are still managing the process but the Targets are able to influence decision making to a degree. It is critical to note that for the criteria for this indicator to be fulfilled the Target representatives have to have sufficient power in the programme to act

on behalf of the Targets and to influence decision making such that they accommodate the Target's wishes in the programme.

G. Targets have control of a specific portion of the budget. The Targets do not have managerial power in budgeting but have a budget dedicated to the programme and can pay leaders and hire specialists to help them understand the technicalities of the programme processes and verify the Outsiders' suggestions.

H. Targets control specific and limited management and governance aspects of the programme. Targets do not have overall managerial power in the programme, but have managerial control over certain defined element of programme.

I. Targets have final veto in the programme. When Targets have final veto and have full governance over the programme the level of Citizen Control is reached. Targets must be involved in management and governances even if Outsiders have the right to veto their decisions. Elements of management include financial and strategic decision making and planning, 'policy-making; hiring and firing; issuing subcontracts for building, buying, or leasing.' (Arnstein 1969: 223) The Targets must have the majority of seats on the programme committees and dominant decision making power over the programme. (Arnstein, 1969: 222) This does not mean absolute power but rather that Targets rather than Outsiders can make the last minute changes and approve or decline final plans.

Whether the original coarse set of indicators or the refined set presented above were used to place respondents' perceptions on the ladder of participation the results would be identical. This new set of indicators evolves from the original set of indicators and is simply a cropped and refined version of this set.

A matrix was established from these indicators to simplify the process of placing a respondent at a particular level on the ladder of participation. The matrix shows the interaction between the indicators and the levels of participation. I mapped the evidence of the indicators from each transcript onto the matrix to establish at which level the respondent is situated. This exercise is demonstrated in the results chapter. In order for perceptions of the Targets' level of participation to be located at a specific level the perceptions must have met the criteria for location at the preceding levels. In other words this is an incremental model.

The presence of indicator **A** shows that the level of *Informing* is in operation. The presence of indicator **A** and **B** shows that the level of *Consulting* is in operation. The presence of indicator **A - D** shows that the level of *Placation* is in operation. The presence of indicator **A - G** shows that the level of *Partnership* is in operation. The presence of indicator **A - H** shows that the level of *Delegated Power* is in operation. The presence of indicators **A - I** shows that the level of *Citizen Control* is in operation. Hence the tool operates in an incremental manner. In the table below the darkened squares show which indicators are required to place a perception at the corresponding level.

Table 1 Matrix of Indicators and Levels

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Informing									
Consulting									
Placation									
Partnership									
Delegated Power									
Citizen Control									

At this point I have departed from Arnstein who describes levels separately and used my description of an incremental system.

Just as the initial indicators had been used as coding categories to identify the level of the individuals, the final indicators were used to identify trends in the levels of the groups. The data used in the individual analysis to explain why individual respondents were at the particular level, was used at the next step of analysis. In this step the Targets were looked at as one group and the Outsiders were looked at as another group. The evidence was used to show where the Targets as a collective were on the ladder and where the Outsiders were at a particular level. The indicators used at this stage were the nine final indicators. This was the next step in data reduction.

For levels where there was more than one indicator all indicators had to be present to say that the level was achieved. For example if there was evidence of indicators **A-E** but not of **F** and **G** the level of participation perceived would remain at the level of Placation, despite the fact that evidence for one of the indicators of the level of Partnership (indicator **E**) was present.

The convergence or divergence of these perceptions of participation of individuals within the Outsiders and Targets as separate groups was explored. The trends between the Outsiders and Targets groups were then examined for divergence or convergence.

In summary, I analysed transcripts of Targets and Outsiders to determine which indicators were the most useful in determining levels of participation. Using this instrument, i.e. the interview schedule and final indicators, I determined which level of participation the respondents' perceptions were situated at individually and as groups. I determined whether there was convergence between individuals and groups. Through the process of developing the instrument I also assessed whether Arnstein's (1969) ladder and the hierarchical measurement of participation added substantial value to development practice.

Chapter Five Results

5.1. Introduction

The trends amongst the Targets and Outsiders are presented separately in order to answer the third, fourth and fifth sub-questions of the central research question²⁰. One of the aims of measuring perceptions of the levels of the Targets' participation is to improve communication between Targets and Outsiders. It is valuable to establish whether there is a difference in the perceptions of these two groups. Identifying this difference can stimulate dialogue and understanding between the two groups.

These results show how the perceptions of the levels of the Targets' participation between the two groups of respondents were located at the level of Placation. Using the final nine indicators I show that the perceptions of individuals from both the Outsider and the Target groups point to the level of Placation. In this chapter examples of evidence drawn from the transcribed interviews are presented to support my observations and conclusions. The interview questions are included only if these questions help to explain the indicator better.²¹ Full reports detailing all of the evidence for each indicator and respondent are available on request from the author.

²⁰ Third sub-question: What are the levels of participation of the targets perceived by the targets individually and as a group within the programme? Is there convergence or divergence within the target group? Fourth sub-question: What are the levels of participation of the targets perceived by the outsiders individually and as a group within the programme? Is there convergence or divergence within the Outsider group? Fifth sub-questions: Is there convergence or divergence between the targets' and outsiders' perceptions of the levels of participation of the target?

²¹ This is in line with Boulton and Hammersley's (1996: 294) advice regarding how much of the surrounding context should be included in data extracts.

5.2. Placing of Respondents on the Ladder

The Targets and Outsiders have been given code names to maintain anonymity, as was agreed in the interview process. In the case of the Targets there were a number of group interviews. The individuals in the group interviews generally agreed with one another, so were seen as adopting one position.

The following tables are a summary of evidence from the transcripts. Y indicates yes, there is evidence to support the indicator(s), and thus, that the indicator is present. N indicates no, there is not evidence to support the indicator(s), and thus the indicator is not present. I was able to place the respondents' perceptions of the Targets' level of participation, based on which indicators were present. The indicators are listed in the methodology chapter.²²

²² A very important indicator that was removed was that vulnerable groups are included in the participatory process. This was an indicator of the level of Placation and the levels below it. This is a weak indicator for a subjective study because vulnerable groups might not be recognised as such by the respondent. The exclusion of the vulnerable is, however, an important criticism of participatory approaches (Chambers, 2005: 107, 93-94). It should be gauged using an objective tool of equity that considers who is participating and who is vulnerable. This task of gauging the exclusion of the vulnerable should be facilitated by an impartial body (Chambers, 2005: 93-95). This is discussed further in the discussion section of this thesis.

Table 2 Summary of the Indicator Results for Each Interview

Key	
IE	Insufficient evidence to tell whether the indicator is present or absent
Y	Yes indicator is present
N	No indicator is not present

Outsiders

			INDICATORS										
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I		
1	OUTSIDERS	O1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Placation	LEVEL
2		O3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Placation	
3		O2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Placation	
4		O4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Placation	
5		O5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Placation	
6		O6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Placation	

Targets

			INDICATORS										
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I		
1	TARGETS	T1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Placation	LEVEL
2		T2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Placation	
3		T3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Placation	
4		T4	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Placation	
5		T5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Placation	
6		T6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Placation	

The Target interviews have been labelled T1 – T6 and the Outsider interviews have been labelled O1 – O6. The Outsiders labelled here as O1 – O6 are individual respondents. The Targets are labelled here as T1 – T6. The labels T1 – T6 are the interview labels. Some of these were group interviews, some individual interviews. T1 was a group interview with three teachers, one of whom was a teacher representative.

T2 and T6 were group interview without any teacher representatives, there were three teachers in the T2 interview and two teachers in the T6 interview. T3 was an individual interview with a teacher representative. T4 and T5 were individual interviews with teachers who were not teacher representatives.

Many of these interviews were conducted in Afrikaans so the transcripts of these interviews are in Afrikaans. Selected responses have been translated into English. The original Afrikaans quotations can be found in the transcripts and reports on each interview that are available on request.

I didn't anticipate that the results would reach this level of agreement. The instrument does not skew the results and this level of agreement is not needed to indicate meaningful results.

Although there was evidence of indicator **E**, there was no evidence for indicators **F** and **G**. For this reason, as depicted in the table above, all of the respondent's perceptions were at the level of Placation. In order for the perceptions of participation to be at the level of Partnership there would need to be evidence of indicators **E**, **F** and **G**. There are various reasons for the strong level of agreement. For indicator **F** to be present the Target representatives need to have a substantial amount of power in their relationship with the Outsiders to allow them access to all the decision making meetings and for them to be able to ensure that the Targets wishes are met. Targets having some financial control, which is the crux of Indicator **G**, also demonstrates a substantial shift in power in favour of the Targets. Given the arguments regarding the role-player relationships in the programme context presented in the discussion chapter of this thesis, it is not surprising that these shifts have not taken place.

The fact that the respondents were all aware of these power relations is a direct consequence of the methodology applied in this research. Only the interviews with the respondents who had an in-depth knowledge of the context and programme were analysed.

These respondents were thoroughly exposed to the program and their perceptions were based on the reality which they had jointly and regularly witnessed. This explains the high level of agreement between the respondents. This is an important lesson regarding the application of this tool, i.e. to select informed respondents and avoid situations where respondents who are not heavily involved in the process to the point that they can offer very little other than wishful thinking in interviews. My attendance at meetings and witnessing of interactions and decision making between Outsiders and Targets was important. The stakeholders saw me at these meetings and knew that I was engaging with various stakeholders and were thus possibly more willing to offer their true opinions rather than wishful thinking. This and knowing the history of the programme, are important methodological steps to take in the application of this tool, especially where Outsiders and Targets have vested interests in the way they are perceived to understand participatory processes in the programme.

5.3. Trends amongst Groups

Using the indicator and level matrix presented in the Methodology Chapter, I concluded that the Outsiders' perceptions were all at the level of Placation, and the Targets' perceptions were located at the level of Placation. In all of the Outsider interviews analysed and in five of the six Target interviews analysed, there was only evidence of indicators **A – E**. As explained in the Methodology Chapter, the presence of indicators **A – E**, and the absence of the other indicators, makes it clear that the level of Placation has been reached, but no higher level. The perceptions of both the Targets and the Outsiders as separate groups are at the level of Placation.

Evidence from the transcripts will now be presented to justify why the perceptions are located at the level of Placation. The evidence relating to the Targets and the outsiders will be presented separately. Evidence pertaining to each indicator for each level is presented below. During the analysis process

evidence was extracted from each transcript regarding each indicator. This level of detail is not provided in this document but is available on request.

5.3.1. Trends Amongst Outsiders

INFORMING

Indicator A: Targets are informed of programme and programme processes

All of the Outsiders thought that the Targets were informed, through various mechanisms, of the decisions and processes involved in the programme. There is evidence of this indicator in all of the transcripts of the Outsiders.

The mechanisms mentioned included the Outsiders giving information to the Targets at introductory meetings, the Outsiders displaying the plans in the school for the Targets to see, and information being given to the Targets by the Target group's representatives.

O1-3 and O5-6 thought that the teachers were informed about the decisions taken at programme committee meetings, because the teachers' representatives were present at the committee meetings, and then they would feed this information back to the other Targets, in this way all of the Targets were kept informed.

O2: ...there's feedback [from Target representatives to Targets] and most of the decisions were made within the programme committee meetings where the teacher representatives are [sic] present.

O3: ...they've got weekly updates and they know what's happening.

The Outsider O1 explained that the plans for the building were put up for the Targets to see and comment on:

O1: ...the drawing plans are pasted on one of the walls at the administration block for the teachers to see... so everybody can comment...

The Outsider O4 thought that the programme was discussed with the Targets

Interviewer: Do you think that the information discussed in the meeting was discussed in depth enough...? [Referring to the meeting held between the Outsiders and Targets explaining the programme plans]

O4: Yes, I think it was...

CONSULTING

Indicator B: Targets give their ideas and input to the programme when asked to by the Outsiders and their input relates to topics defined by the Outsiders.

All of the Outsiders showed evidence of this indicator in their perceptions of the Target's participation.

This indicator is concerned with the freedom and ease with which the Targets can communicate their wishes or objections to the outsiders. All the Outsiders thought that the Targets gave input into the programme when asked. Some of the Outsiders mentioned receiving input from the teachers about what they wanted in the programme from the teachers' drawings. These drawings were requested by the Outsiders, and they support indicator **B**. The indicator **B** can be seen as a building block for indicator **C**. O3 supported the statement about the teachers giving input through drawings, as the Outsiders had requested.

This is evidence of indicator **B**.

O3: We spoke to them at meetings and said that we obviously do not understand how their school works... so we said 'Make diagrams for us, and we will have a look at it [sic], and you draw your own classroom as such, and bring it to us'. So they went in the background and did their own processes [the teachers drew their ideal classrooms] .

PLACATION

Indicator C: Targets, at will, express their ideas about the plans to the Outsiders through various channels and representatives at will.

The Outsiders all thought that the Targets had opportunities to express their ideas about the plans to the Outsiders.

The Outsiders all thought the Targets were able to spontaneously give input to the programme via their representatives and at meetings. This feedback mechanism supports indicator **C**. Evidence of indicator **C** places the perceptions of the Outsiders as being at the level of Placation.

According to O2-5 the teacher representatives gave input regarding what they desired in the programme. This was a willing and free expression of what the Targets wanted from the programme. This supports indicator **C**.

Interviewer: Have the teacher representatives given input in terms of what they want in the programme? O5: Ja... the classroom layouts [are an] example. The headmaster made a lot of input on safety during construction and during the demolishing process.

O5 explained that one of the functions of the meetings held with the teachers was to allow them to express their thoughts and feelings about the programme to the Outsiders, again this supports indicator **C**.

O5: We also gave teachers an opportunity, I like to call it a gripe session. Teachers could say their frustration with the current school and could highlight areas of danger.

O1 thought that the Targets could convey their opinions through the teacher representatives, whenever they wanted to. O4 thought that Targets could negotiate directly with the Outsiders about their own interests. Thus input from the Targets was not limited to occasions when it was requested by the Outsiders. This supports indicator **C**.

O1: The teachers will talk to the principal. The principal will listen to what the teachers wants [sic], and then principal will report back to the architect and say 'Listen here are our needs...' Then they will come to me and they will put it on the drawing. And then I will have a look at the norms and standards

Interviewer: Do the teachers have feedback channels and negotiation opportunities in terms of the project planning? O4: They've been negotiating directly with the project consultants.

Indicator D: Targets have representatives on decision making committees.

All the Outsiders confirmed that Targets had representatives on decision making committees.

Three of the senior grade teachers and the principal represented the interests of the teachers. O6, O4 and O2 noted that the principal and other teachers sat in on programme committee meetings and represented the other teachers. O5, O1 and O3 explained some of the Targets' representatives' activities on the programme committee.

O6: ... the principal is one of the stakeholders, and I think he selected those teachers to select him in the process... [referring to the other Target representatives] they are welcome to sit in and just listen to the progress. Interviewer: Can the teachers give feedback and decide what should happen in the programme? O2: I think there's feedback and most of the decisions were made within the programme committee meetings where the teacher representatives were present.

Interviewer: Have the teacher representatives given input in terms of what they want in the programme? O5: Ja... the classroom layouts for example.

PARTNERSHIP

Indicator E: Targets demand accountability transparency from the Target representatives.

All of the Outsiders thought that the Target representatives fed the information that they received about the programme at the programme committee meetings back to the Targets.

In relation to this indicator the Target representatives give feedback to the Targets regarding what they know about the programme. Targets should be able to ask and can demand answers from the Target representatives about the programme.

Some of the Outsiders didn't know a great deal about the Target's communication system, but assumed that the Target representatives were feeding information back to the Targets somehow. The Outsiders didn't know if the Targets could demand answers from the target representatives. The perception that there is feedback from the Target representatives to the Targets is sufficient evidence of this indicator. Because they didn't attend the meetings between the Targets and Target representatives, it would not be possible for the Outsiders to know if the targets demanded that the Outsiders provide the Target representatives with answers. Evidence that the respondents thought that the Target representatives gave feedback to the targets is sufficient evidence of the presence of this indicator.

O1 and O6 explained the teacher representative (in this case the principal) gave teachers' feedback to the Outsiders. It can be assumed that the Target representatives updated the Targets on news of the programme to get appropriate feedback from them.

O6: ... the library, the media centre, all those aspects came through from the school itself, or from the principal. It appears that most of them would make their suggestions to the principal who would bring it [sic] to the meeting

O2-3 and O5 thought the Target representatives provided a communication link between the Targets and the Outsiders.

O5: their [the representatives] role is to communication between the school and the programme team, because the programme is not only building a new school, but building a new school with a [sic] current school being run at the same time, so there's a lot of coordination ... and also to keep them [the teachers] up to date with what's happening here.

O3: ... I'm assuming that they've got weekly updates and they know what's happening.

Indicator F: Targets demand accountability enforcement from the target representatives.

Evidence to support this indicator was not found in the statements of any of the Outsiders.

Schedler et al. (1993) explain that accountability in terms of enforcement means that people have the power to subject representatives to sanctions, if they do not act in the desired manner. To be able to act as required the Target representatives need to have full access to all the meetings where programme decisions are made and a certain degree of power to insist that their wishes and the wishes of the targets are heeded. It must be perceived that the Target representatives have a degree of influence on the programme decisions.

O6 showed that he thought the Targets didn't have any say in the decision making; in other words, that the Target representatives were passive during the committee meetings; didn't have full meeting access and didn't have an impact on the programme plans.

O6: I think their input is garnished in the beginning of the programme. They do not really have to approve it [the plans].

Interviewer: Who has the right to change or adapt plans? O6: It will probably be either IDT, or the Education Department. Interviewer: So it's not the teachers or the principal? O6: No

O6: The principal is one of the stakeholders, and he selected those teachers to help him in the process... they are welcomed to sit in and just listen to the progress. But there [are] meetings outside of that, where the professional teams will discuss [programme decisions] For example, tomorrow we have meetings just for the professional teams.

O5 seemed to think that the Target's roles were to give ideas, but that these didn't have to be put into effect. O5 thought that the Outsiders ran the programme. This implied that the targets didn't have the power to demand that their wishes be implemented.

O5: ... the targets take on the role of keeping things in running order, and helping to make the conditions right, so that the outsiders can run the show...

O3 didn't seem to think that the Target representatives contributed to the planning or influenced the decisions of the programme committee. According to O1-3 the decisions within the programme were based solely on the list of criteria from the Department of Education. This list was known as the Accommodation Schedule, or the Norms and Standards for Primary Schools (See Appendix G).

Interviewer: Who decides on the priorities for the school building, for example, [the] priority for classrooms over cafeteria? [This example came up in the meeting I had attended that afternoon with the architect] O3: The DoE have a list of priorities for schools. [O3's assistant presented one of the teacher's pictures for the technology classroom] We haven't gotten to this detail yet, [he is referring to the drawings of the teachers] because its not part of the Norms and Standards for schools.

The Target representatives seemed to have the power to make suggestions and give feedback to the Targets. Accountability is limited because their power is limited. Representatives do not have the power to enforce the Target group's demands, so the Targets have no power of enforcement either, so accountability is limited.

Indicator G: Targets have control of a specific portion of the budget.

None of the Outsiders thought that the Targets controlled the budget; they all thought that the budget was controlled by the DoE and IDT. This evidence does not support this indicator.

According to the O1-6, the IDT and the DoE manages the money, not the Targets.

Interviewer: Who manages the money? O6: The IDT. Interviewer: Who decided that IDT should manage the money? O6: Through the programme implementation agreement [with the DoE]. Interviewer: Who had the right to decided [sic] how the resources and money were to be used for these activities? O5: IDT

According to the O3, Targets were not responsible for the appointment of contractors because they didn't control the budget. This does not support this indicator.

Interviewer: Were the targets involved in appointing the contractors? O3: No ... they won't be able to do that because the funding ultimately is going to come through the IDT.

According to the O4 the DoE manages the budget.

Interviewer: And who manages that money? O4: The Education Department.

DELEGATED POWER

Indicator H: Targets control specific and limited management and governance aspects of the programme.

None of the Outsiders thought that the Targets had managerial or governance power in the programme.

According to O5 the teachers didn't express their concerns and issues at meetings. He didn't think that the Targets had the power to dominate decision. O2-6 didn't think the Targets had decision making responsibilities in relation to the awarding of contracts or other programme activities. The appointment of contractors is one of the managerial functions, and the Targets didn't have this power. The evidence here does not support indicator H.

Interviewer: Can you think of an example where the Targets had more decision making power than the Outsiders... in any important decisions about the programme? O5: No.

O5: IDT. The professional team will give advice on who should be awarded the contract. The client [DoE] will make the final decision.

Interviewer: Are the Targets responsible for any activities? O5: No, nothing. As far as I know, the only thing that was ever asked from the principal was to set up a meeting.

Interviewer: ...who has the right to decide to whom contracts are awarded? O6: the IDT. Interviewer: Who has the right to change or adapt plans? O6: It will probably be either [the] IDT or the Education Department. Interviewer: So it's not the teachers or the principal? O6: No Interviewer: Do the Targets then need to just approve the plans, or do they give input into the plans? O6: I think their input is garnished in the beginning of the programme. They do not really have to approve it[sic].

Interviewer: Are the Targets responsible for any decisions? O4: No.

O3 made it very clear that the Outsiders, not the Targets, were in charge of the programme management.

O3: ...our purpose is to manage. The others are to participate... IDT manages, we manage. We manage our team, which is quantity surveyors and engineers, so on. [The] IDT manage the programme, to make sure that it happens. Other than that, no one else manages.

O2 thought that the Targets had a co-operative rather than managerial role.

Interviewer: What are the rights and responsibilities of the Targets in terms of this programme? O2: The teachers' rights and responsibilities regarding the programme would most probably be basically to co-operate and give inputs, where requested and where needed.

O4 and O1 explained that the decisions about plans were based on the will of the DoE and the norms and standards from the DoE. O1 showed that he thought that the DoE made the rules, and the Targets had to comply. The Targets do not seem to have any say, let alone managerial powers.

O1: ... normally the school will ask more for what they can get.[in reference to some of the teachers' demands which couldn't be catered for.] You understand what I'm saying? So yes, unfortunately we have a set of rules set by education, and education will tell them 'Listen here no, you can't get that'.

CITIZEN CONTROL

Indicator I: Targets have final veto in the programme.

It is clear from the above section that none of the Outsiders thought that the Targets dominated decision making committees, let alone have a final veto over decisions.

According to O4-6 Outsiders had a final veto on decisions.

O6: ...I think that decisions gets [sic] made between the Education Department and the IDT

Interviewer: Who makes the final decisions about programme issues?

O5: The programme manager, IDT

Interviewer: Who makes the final decisions about programme proposals?

O4: The Education Department.

Interviewer: Were the Targets responsible for any decisions? O4: No.

O5 noted that at the "End of the day it's the programme manager, which is [the] IDT who makes the final decision [as] to what's gonna happen, when and how"; and that the Outsiders make final programme decisions.

5.3.2. Trends amongst Targets

INFORMING

Indicator A: Targets are informed of programme plans and processes.

All of the Targets thought that they and the other teachers were informed of the programme processes and plans through the Target representatives and at staff meetings.

Some reported that there was two-way communication between Targets and Outsiders. In interviews 1 and 4, the respondents confirmed that there was two-way communication between the Targets and the Outsiders, and that the Targets were informed of the programme progress.

Interviewer: Is there two-way communication between the Outsiders and the Targets. T1: Yes.

In interviews 2 and 5 the teachers confirmed that they felt they were informed of all of the happenings because the Target representatives reported back to them on the after the meetings.

Interviewer: Were you informed of some, or most, or all of the decisions and happenings in the programme? T2: We knew about everything. If they held a meeting [the programme committee], or even before it happened, the principal told us.

In interview 3 the teacher representative reported that he was informed of all of the decisions, actions and happenings.

Interviewer: Were you informed of some, or most, or all of the decisions, actions and happenings in the programme? T2: I was always informed about the whole programme.

In interview 5 respondents noted that the teachers were asked to comment on the plans, and whether they received feedback about their comments. The teachers were kept informed, which is evidence to support this indicator.

Interviewer: Who drew up those plans? T5: The plans were drawn up last year already. Interviewer: Who contributed to those [the school] plans? T5: We [the teachers] had a say in it. We had a meeting to discuss the needs of our school ... a staff meeting. Interviewer: Were you ever given feedback about what happened to those needs that you and the teachers drew up? T5: We get feedback all the time.

CONSULTING

Indicator B: Targets give their ideas and input to the programme when asked to so by the Outsiders, and their input relates to topics defined by the Outsiders.

The evidence in the transcripts shows that all of the Targets think that they and the other Targets were asked for their input, this evidence supports the presence of this indicator.

There is some evidence of teachers being asked to give input in the form of drawings, this supports indicator **B**. The teachers from interview one and two explained that the teachers were asked to make lists and drawings of what they wanted their classrooms to look like. These were consulted when decisions about the building were being made. This supports indicator **B**.

T1 [Target representative] I asked the junior level teachers what they wanted in the school. They met and talked to their leader. She drew up a list of items and gave it to me. I used it to make a drawing of the classrooms for them. We showed it [to the Outsiders].

T2: ...We made a list of what we wanted. I put it together and gave [it] to Mr... [a Target representative]

PLACATION

Indicator C. Targets, at will, express their ideas about the plans to the Outsiders through various channels and representatives.

All the teachers thought that they could give the inputs, to the staff representatives and at staff meetings.

This indicator is also concerned with the freedom and ease with which the Targets can communicate their wishes or objections to the Outsiders. The teacher representatives thought they could say what they wished at committee meetings. These two points support indicator **C**.

In interviews one, two, five and six the teachers explained that they could give input to the teacher representatives at the staff meetings. The representatives took this feedback to the committee meetings.

T1: We could give inputs and ask questions at the staff meetings. The teachers could have their say.

In interviews three and four the Target representatives explained that they could freely give opinions in meetings and to the Department of Education.

T3: Yes, I gave my opinions and suggestions and what I thought must happen... our needs. Interviewer: When do you give your opinions? T3: My opinion was given in our meetings with the architect and the IDT [committee meetings] and I also gave my opinions in the Department of Education's offices.

Indicator D: Targets have representatives on decision making committees

All of the evidence given by the teachers above shows that the teachers know they have Target representatives representing them on the programme committee.

In interviews five, one and two the teachers confirmed that they had representatives on various committees, who presented their needs.

Interviewer: Are there any Targets on the programme committee? T1: The school is also represented on the programme committee... [lists names of the teacher representatives on the committee]

Teacher representatives in interviews three and four explained that they represented the teachers at meetings and let the Outsiders know what the teachers wanted.

Interviewer: Do you have any work in the programme? T3: Reports to the staff. Interviewer: From the programme committee to the staff meetings?

T3: Yes.

T3: My role was to represent the teachers and the community...

T4: We go to the meetings, listen and give input about how we feel the plan must be [as teachers]. There is information from the staff about what they want and do not want.

PARTNERSHIP

Indicator E: Targets demand accountability transparency from the Target representatives.

There is evidence to support this indicator for all of the Targets.

The Target representatives feedback to the targets what they know and how they are involved in the programme. Targets ask and can demand answers from the Target representatives.

The teachers in interviews one – two and four - six explained that their representatives reported back to them about what happened in the committee meetings, and how the programme was getting along.

T1: There is feedback on the programme in the meetings.

T1: The men usually come [sic] there [to the programme committee meetings] with plans that must be approved. They give feedback on how far the plans are.

T2: We knew about everything. If they [the programme committee] held a meeting, or even before it happened, the principal told us... Every step was fed back to the school.

T4: He [the principal] would, for example, tell the staff every time he wrote a letter to the DoE. Then, we as staff would, say, put emphasis on what we want, for example, how many classrooms... if there is feedback from the DoE. We come together every morning... he always discusses things at all times with the staff.

The teacher representative in interview three explained that the Target representatives ensured that they gave feedback to the other Targets so that the Targets were kept informed of progress.

T3: My responsibility in the programme is to ensure that there is healthy communication, so that the staff are well informed...

Indicator F: Targets demand accountability enforcement from the target representatives.

The evidence does not support the presence of this indicator for any of the targets.

Requirements for this indicator are that the Targets would, through their representatives, have some influence, and would be able to hold their representatives accountable if their needs were not being met. This indicator isn't only about holding the Targets responsible but also about the representatives having the power to exercise their mandate from the Targets.

The teachers in interviews one and six were asked about their rights and opportunities in the programme. They responded that they were given a opportunities to give their input, but didn't have any influence on the programme because they didn't have any bargaining power or decision making rights decision making. Teachers in interviews two, four and five said that they couldn't really influence plans.

Interviewer: what are the teacher's responsibilities and rights in the programme? T1: We were given an opportunity to sketch what we wanted our classrooms to look like, and this was given to the programme committee.

T1: They [the Outsiders] do most of the planning. We can give out opinions in meetings, but the architect has already drawn up the plans and the IDT works with him.

Interviewer: Do the teachers on the programme committee influence the building programme? T1: Not really, we can ask questions and give input, but it does not influence the programme much.

When asked if they had any decision making power the teachers claimed that they had none. This shows that they do not think that they can trust the representatives to influence decisions on their behalf.

T2: No, we do not have that decision making power... We can't make decisions.

The Target representative in interview three mentioned that his responsibilities were to report back to the staff, and to maintain good communication between the staff and Outsiders. He didn't mention any

decision making or managerial responsibilities. When asked if he had a choice in determining what stayed in the plan and what was excluded, he said that he had no say. He said he was not invited to the meeting in which the DoE made the final decisions about what would be in the approved budget and plans, and what wouldn't.

Interviewer: And do you have a choice in what stays in the plan and what is removed? T3: No, I do not have a choice in these [matters] because I was not even invited to the meeting. I was not at the meeting where the final decisions about the plans were made. Interviewer: Was that the meeting with the architect and the IDT and the... T3: and the DoE, Yes. No Target members were in attendance. [The aim and outcome of that meeting was what parts of the plan would be approved as within the budget].

Indicator G: Targets have control of a specific portion of the budget.

The Targets all agreed that the Outsiders controlled that the finances in the programme – this evidence does not support the presence of this indicator for any of the Targets.

In interview one the teachers explained that the Outsiders had fixed regulations regarding programme plans and that these were linked to the finances supplied by the DoE. This shows that they thought that the Outsiders controlled the budget, not the Targets. Targets in interviews two, three, four, five and six all agreed that the outsiders controlled the finances.

T1: As soon as half a meter is added to a class [room] there are financial implications. That is why there are regulations. They [the outsiders] are the ones with the money. Interviewer: Does the DoE have the financial power?

T1: Yes.

T2: We are financially dependent on the DoE.

T5: The people with the money decides [sic] what we can have, and what we do not need at the moment

T6: The IDT are the builders. They are the people who give the money.

In interview three the Target representative explained that the decisions around resources and money were managed by the outsiders and that he didn't have any part in financial decisions.

Interviewer: Who has the right to decide how resources and money are used in the programme activities? T3: This is strongly managed by the architect, [the] IDT and the builders.

DELEGATED POWER

Indicator H: Targets control specific and limited management and governance aspects of the programme.

The evidence presented above shows that none of the Targets thought that the Targets had any financial control.

There is no evidence from the Targets to support indicator **H**. The teachers in interview three thought that the Outsiders managed the money and resources. This shows that they didn't think that the Targets had any specific control over the management or governance of the programme.

Interviewer: Who has the right to decide how resources and money are used in the programme activities? T3: This is strongly managed by the architect, [the] IDT and the builders.

The teachers in interview one explained that the Outsiders made the decisions. When asked if they had any decision making power the teachers in interview two claimed that they had none. This is evidence against the teachers having managerial or governance control.

T1: They [the outsiders] do most of the planning. We can give our opinions in meetings, but the architect has already drawn up the plans and the IDT works with him.

Interviewer: Do the teachers on the programme committee influence the building programme? T1: Not really, we can ask questions and give input but it does not influence the programme much.

T2: No, we do not have that decision making power... We can't make decisions.

CITIZEN CONTROL

Indicator I: Targets have final veto in the programme.

The same evidence used to show that none of the Targets thought that the Target representatives had financial control or accountability reinforcement, can also indicate that the Targets didn't think that they had a final veto.

It is clear that if the Targets do not have to attend all of the meetings, and do not have any power to ensure that some of their wishes are adhered to, they certainly do not have a final veto over decisions. It is not necessary to repeat this evidence.

5.3. Summary of the Results

I have shown that indicators can be developed from Arnstein's descriptions of the levels of participation. These were refined and reduced to nine indicators which were successfully used to place the respondent's perceptions on the ladder of participation. Both the Targets and the Outsiders' perceptions of the Targets' level of participation tended towards the Placation level. There was convergence within and between the two groups of respondents. In this way the sub-questions of the research were answered. The usefulness of the activity of placing the respondent's perceptions on the ladder will be discussed in the next chapter.

The entire exercise has merit as a monitoring tool within the development context, but needs to be used in conjunction with other tools relating to participation. This is discussed below.

Chapter Six Discussion

6.1 Introduction

The central research question asks:

Is Arnstein's ladder of participation a useful basis for an instrument to be used to gauge the Targets' and the Outsiders' perceptions of participation in a South African development intervention, which claims to use a participatory approach?

In this chapter I discuss the feasibility of using Arnstein's work to develop a tool to gauge perceptions of participation. The perceptions of the Targets' level of participation in this programme were at the level of Placation for both the Targets and Outsiders. The way in which this was deduced and the potential reasons for the perceptions being at this level, as well as the possible benefits that the Outsiders and Targets gain from this perception, are explored. The usefulness of measuring perceptions of participation is then explored in the broader political context of supporting substantive democracy and working against structural violence.

6.2. Can Arnstein's Work be Used as the Basis of a Tool to Gauge Perceptions of Participation?

The findings show that with the help of Arnstein's work on participation one can develop useful indicators for gauging people's perceptions of participation. Some of the indicators developed from Arnstein's descriptions are useful in placing perceptions on a ladder of participation and other indicators are not. The indicators which were not useful were abandoned.

Some indicators were excluded because they were not relevant to the modern African situation. Arnstein's ladder of participation is based on data from three American federal social programmes in the 1960's. Other

indicators were too abstract or vague to successfully translate into useful questions.

Another reason for excluding aspects of Arnstein's descriptions is that certain features within a specific level contradict other features used to describe that same level. For example at the level of Informing Arnstein says that information flows one way, from Outsiders to Targets. However she also states that at the level of Informing targets have some power to influence outcomes and can question the Outsiders about the plans. If information flowed only from outsiders to target the Targets would be unable to ask Outsiders questions and influence the plans. For this reason the features of Targets having *power to influence outcomes* and *space to question plans* were excluded as indicators of the level of Informing, even though Arnstein included them in her description of this level. There are other examples where I excluded descriptions that were ambiguous or contradicted the general themes within the same level. The selection of the final indicators and exclusion of contradicting descriptions is explained in depth in the Methodology Chapter and Appendix E.

Once the inappropriate indicators were removed and the appropriate elements of indicators were refined the respondents' perceptions could easily be placed on one of the rungs on the ladder of participation. Certain background information gained from interviews with key role-players, who knew the context well, provided contextual insights so as to integrate local examples and concretise questions aimed at discovering the presence or absence of an indicator.

6.3. Justification for Measuring Perceptions of Participation Using Ladders

Measurement of participation contributes to some of the aims of people-centred development. As discussed above the humanist approach in people-centred development is concerned with improvement of personal and institutional capabilities towards just distribution of improvements in quality of life (Korten 1990: 76 in Davids et al, 2009: 17). The humanist approach to development is concerned with the importance of human consciousness in the improvements in social realities (Korten 1990: 76 in Davids et al, 2009: 159) and the critical role that dialogue between external change agents and Targets of interventions plays in moving human consciousness forward towards improvements in social realities.

If all indicators used in this study were discussed amongst Outsiders and Targets there could be some clarity as to what the participatory process involves and whether there is satisfaction with this process. In this way the instrument designed and tested in this study promotes people-centred development. It puts the spotlight on how the Targets are participating; what level of control they have and want in the programmes; how satisfied both parties are with this; and how the participation and control affects the achievement of the goals of the programme. In this way the tool helps to advance the humanistic goals of dialogical development and improve social realities through the advancing of human consciousness (Davids, 2009: 162-163).

6.4. Reasons and Benefits of Perceptions of Placation

Chambers argues that the highest forms of participation by Targets in development are not necessarily in the best interests of the Targets or the development process. With this in mind I now reflect on the main finding in the Klapmuts Mud-school Project Placation is the perceived level of participation of the Targets by the respondents.

The common perception of the respondents in this study is that the Targets reach a level of participation that is described in Arnstein's terms as Placation. They do not have a Partnership with the Outsiders nor do they have Citizen Control in the development process. Is this in the interests of the Targets and people-centred, endogenous development?

In my research both the Outsiders and the Targets agreed that the Targets were not comfortable with the possibility of managing the finances or taking responsibility for the major decisions in the programme for various political, capacity and time related reasons. These are features of higher levels of participation (see indicators of Partnership, Delegated Power and Citizen Control).

Both the Outsiders and the Targets felt that the Targets, who were the school teachers, didn't have the time to manage the programme given their demanding workload as teachers. Targets and Outsiders were concerned that the parents would become suspicious and accusatory if the teachers had financial decision making power. Neither the Targets nor the Outsiders thought that the teachers had the capacity to make decisions about the technical elements of the programme. The locus of financial and major decision making power in the programme, which are essential elements of indicators **G – I**, could be a source of tension between the teachers and the parents at the school. This could mean that the goals of the programme might not be met and this could have a negative impact on the social reality of the people affected by the programme.

Stoker's (2006: 96) CLEAR model identifies five factors that are helpful in understanding this situation.

- C:** Can do This relates to available resources and knowledge to enable participation.
- L:** Like to do. This refers to a sense of attachment that reinforces participation.
- E:** Enabled to do. This refers to civic institutional support facilitating participation.
- A:** Asked to do. This refers to the mobilisation of the public by government or civil society structures.
- R:** Responded to. This refers to participants seeing evidence that their views are being taken into consideration by the authorities and their representatives. (Stoker, 2006: 96)

In particular, his *Can Do* and *Like to Do* factors. In terms of the *Can Do* element, the teachers do not have the capacity or time to make decisions. They are cautious of the reactions of the parents should the latter feel that the teachers have too much control. This shows that the teachers might not *Like To* have too much decision making and financial control in the situation.

Accountability in terms of transparency (relating to indicators **E**) and that the Targets could give their input in decision making might have improved the trust between Outsiders and Targets. This level of transparency and the opportunities to give input might have built on the Target's capacities. Despite a lower level of perceptions of participation by the Targets, improvements in substantive democracy seem to have been made, as well as reductions in structural violence potentialities.

Some of the Targets seemed frustrated at being left out of meetings and not being able to get comprehensive feedback. These two factors also refer to indicators **E** and **F**. Some Targets felt that certain needs that they presented to the Target representatives, or that these representatives presented to the Outsiders, were not taken into account.

There seemed to be some frustration and miscommunication between the Outsiders and Target group over budgets and changes to the plans. Although both targets and outsiders agreed that the targets didn't have much direct influence on the final plans, they gave different reasons for this. If the Targets and Outsiders had used a tool such as the one developed in this thesis, they could have would have had a greater understanding of the various interpretations of the situation. Compromises could have been made, if needed, to reduce frustrations and improve programme outcomes. The use of the measurement tool refined and developed in this study could improve communication and critical reflection on the participatory process by the stakeholders. It could also result in conscious changes in the level of participation.

6.7. The Usefulness of Measuring the Levels of Participation in the broader Political Context

I will now explore how gauging levels of perceived participation help us to understand whether substantive democracy and structural violence were affected at the level of Placation and which level is the most appropriate to achieve the goals of substantive democracy.

Heller explains that substantive democracy moves beyond formal democratic processes to outcomes which protect the poor against social domination and which promote social citizenship which is inclusive of subordinate classes (Heller, 2000: 489-490). Through substantive democracy vulnerable citizens are able to participate in deciding on how government spends tax money because they are able to influence development programmes which are funded from taxes (Heller, 2000: 489-490).

Structural violence is a form of violence where 'violence is built into the structure and shows up as unequal power and consequently unequal life chances' (Galtung, 1969: 171-172).

Structural violence can manifest as unequal distribution of resources, and exclusion from positions which have the power to decide the distribution of resources (Galtung, 1969: 123-174).

Even though the level of Citizen Control has not been achieved in Klapmuts School building programme, the factors present at the level of Placation still promote a degree of substantive democracy, and work against structural violence. In the Klapmuts School building programme, structural violence has been somewhat ameliorated by the creation of a structure where Outsiders and Targets sit on the same committee. This has helped break down power barriers which existed when the Target group had limited access to information. Targets have been kept informed. Access to information has created a power structure whereby power is more equally distributed between Outsiders and Targets.

Oppressive power relations that work against substantive democracy, as described by Heller (2000), are countered through participatory systems which inform Targets, which have a contingent of Target representatives on decision making boards and have systems that allow Targets to express their opinions to Outsiders at will. As described above the outcomes of substantive democracy are concerned with protecting the poor against social domination and promoting social citizenship inclusive of subordinate classes (Heller, 2000: 489-490). By improving communication between Targets and Outsiders and by improving the Targets' access to information the potential for social domination of the Targets by the more powerful Outsiders is diminished and substantive democracy is supported.

The improved awareness of power dynamics and improved communication around relationships achieved through measuring participation, as described by Chambers (2005:105) contributes to achieving substantive democracy and decreasing structural violence. If there is a desire to achieve substantive democracy, a participatory measurement tool can clarify the power relations and highlight where changes are needed if power is unfairly distributed.

Chapter Seven Conclusions and Recommendations

In this final chapter I conclude with some remarks about the aim of the project, the methods used, the key findings and limitations of the study and make some recommendations.

7.1. Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to develop a tool, based on Arnstein's Ladder of Participation, to measure perceptions of participation and to test whether Arnstein's ladder was an adequate basis for such a tool. I have created an instrument to gauge the level of participation perceived in an intervention that claims to use a participatory approach. This instrument has three elements: a data gathering interview schedule and a set of indicators and a matrix that matches indicators and levels of participation that can be used to interpret the data and place respondents' perceptions on a ladder of participation. It has been found that Arnstein's ladder is useful in the creation of the tool but that her work needed clarification and some adjustment for it to be more useful to gauge levels of participation.

Various data collection and data analysis methods were used to create this tool. The data collection tools included semi-structured interviews, participant observation, review of archival and documentary sources and background meetings. The data analysis was guided by Miles and Huberman's (1994: 10-12) three step iterative process of data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing. NVivo computer based qualitative data analysis was used in the data analysis process. Indicators of perceived levels of participation were developed. An interview schedule was designed to test for the presence of the indicators. Outsiders and Targets involved in the Mud Schools Eradication Programme as it was implemented at Klapmuts Primary School were interviewed using this interview schedule. By analysing transcripts of these interviews I established which indicators were the most useful in helping place on an imaginary ladder the respondents' perceptions about the Targets' levels of participation in the development project.

The indicators and the questions from the interview schedule used in this study make up the instrument that can be used in other similar exercises to measure perceptions about Targets' levels of participation in a development project.

Key findings include the observation that some of Arnstein's descriptions provide a useful basis for indicators to measure perceptions of participation whilst others do not. Those indicators that are based on useful descriptions can be used to gauge perceptions of the Targets' level of participation in a development project. The instrument designed for this study was effectively used to place perceptions of most of the individual respondents, and group perceptions, at the level of Participation. However, the instrument does not gauge reasons for perceptions nor does it measure equity in participation – both of which are critical elements in participatory development discourse.

To assess participatory practices used in an intervention a three prong approach should be applied, i.e. gauging the level of participation perceived; understanding the reasons for this perception and understanding the level of equity of participation amongst the Targets. The instrument created in this thesis only addresses the first of these three. Measures for the other two elements still need to be designed and tested.

Although gauging the perceived level of participation might not be the key element in the participatory process it does open the door to key dialogues relating to power and control. This should help to build trust and improve development outcomes.

In conclusion this study was useful in adapting Arnstein's model to produce a set of indicators and a graphic model that can be used as a tool to place perceptions on a ladder of participation. I have shown how this tool, in combination with other measures can be used to improve effective and transparent participatory practice. If participatory processes are framed effectively within paradigms relating to development as freedom, and working against structural violence, techniques, principles and monitoring frameworks

might be developed such that these participatory processes can result in improved citizen control, decreased structural violence and deepened substantive democracy. Additional tools to gauge participatory practices need to be developed. With these developments in mind, I now turn to some recommendations.

7.2. Recommendations

The three elements needed to assess participatory practices in development (the level of participation, the reasons for perceptions and equity in participation), can not be measured using only one tool. Reports on subjective experiences can reveal the level of participation and reasons for this level. The levels of equity in the participation of the various Targets can only be measured through objective investigation by parties that are not involved in the initiative. Three different instruments are needed. Arnstein's earlier work has been refined and developed to design the instrument to gauge the perceived level of participation. However, to gauge the other two elements I recommend that we draw on the works of other authors who also adopt a people-centred perspective.

Stoker's (2006) model could be used to design a qualitative instrument which could gauge the reasons behind the perceived level of participation. Stoker's model helps to identify why people are participate in a particular way.

One of the major contentious issues in interventions that claim to use a participatory approach is that Targets do not participate equally. Equity in development interventions concerns the nature of power relations between those who have developmental needs and those who have resources to help fulfil these needs (Diallo, 2007: 3-4). Equity can also be understood in terms of the power relations among the Targets and how much they give and receive in a participatory development intervention relative to their own personal capitals (Chambers, 2005: 93 – 97). For example, two people might both be asked to contribute equally in time or resources to a programme in

the name of participation but the one may have to sacrifice far more than the other to contribute the same amount of time or resources. Chambers argues that this is not a fair approach because it does not promote equity (Chambers, 2005: 93 – 97).²³

Participation might be elevated to the level of Citizen Control but depending on which citizens or Targets are in control, vulnerable citizens might be excluded or manipulated and abused (Chambers, 2005: 107). Chambers describes the exclusion of the vulnerable in participatory practices as a pervasive problem in development (Chambers, 2005: 93 – 97). I agree with Chambers when he advocates the appropriate use of “authoritative, non-participatory interventions to ensure that those who are poor and weak gain and do not lose” (Chambers, 2005: 107).

²³ Chambers discusses in detail ways in which participation might increase inequality. (Chambers, 2005: 93 - 97)

Bibliography

- Arnstein, S.R. 1969. A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. 35(4): 216-224.
- Atkinson, D. 1996. Civil society after the transition. In *Reconstruction, Development and People*. J. Coetzee and J. Graaf, Eds. Johannesburg: International Thompson Publishing. 287 – 311.
- Ayers, A.J. 2006. Demystifying Democratization: The Global Constitution Neo-Liberal Politics in Africa. *Third World Quarterly*. 27 (2): 321 – 354.
- Babbie, E. and Mouton, J. 2001. *The Practice of Social Research*. South Africa: Oxford University Press.
- Bauman, L. J. and Adair, E. G. 1992. The Use of Ethnographic Interviewing to inform Questionnaire Construction. *Health, Education & Behaviour*. 19: 9-23.
- Boulton, D. and Hammersley, M. 1996. Analysis of Unstructured Data. In *Data Collection and Analysis*. R. Sapsford and V. Jupp. Eds. London: Sage Publications. 282-296.
- Chambers, R. 2005. *Ideas for Development*. London: Earthscan.
- Chambers, R. 1995. Paradigm shifts and the practice of participatory research and development. In *Power and Participatory Development: Theory and Practice*. N. Nelson and S. Wright., Eds. London: Intermediate Technology Publications. 30-42.
- Cooke, B. and Kothari, U. 2001. *Participation: the New Tyranny*, London: Zed Books.
- Davids, I., Theron, F. and Maphunye, K. J. 2009. *Participatory Development in South Africa a Development Management Perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- De Wet, J. P. and Erasmus, Z. 2005. Towards rigour in qualitative analysis. *Qualitative research Journal*. 5 (1):27-40.
- Diallo, Y. 2007. Genuine Participation in Social Change Participation: the Experiences of Benefactors and Beneficiaries in Guinea. Doctoral Thesis. Scripps College of Communication of Ohio University.
- Fielding, N. & Lee, R. 1998. *Computer analysis and qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.

- Galtung, J. 1969. Violence, Peace and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*. 6 (3): 167 – 191.
- Gilbert, N. 2008. *Researching Social Life*. London: AGE Publications Ltd.
- Heller, P. 2000. Degrees of Democracy: Some Comparative Lessons from India. *World Politics*. 52 (4): 484-519.
- Independent Development Trust. 2009. Website: www.idt.org.za (accessed August 2009)
- Kaplan, A. 1994. *NGOs, Civil Society and Capacity Building: Towards the Development of a Strategy*. Durban: Olive Information Service. AVOCADO series, 05/94.
- Kapoor, I. 2002. The Devil's in the Theory: a Critical Assessment of Robert Chamber's Work on Participatory Development. *Third World Quarterly*. 23 (1): 101-117.
- Keough, N. 1998. Participatory Development Principles and Practice: Reflections of a Western Development Worker. *Community Development Journal*. 33 (3): 187-96.
- MCA Africa. July 2007. Draft Klapmuts Spatial Development Framework. Mobray. For the Stellenbosch Municipality Planning Department. (Unpublished).
- Miles, M. & Huberman, A. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Murambiwa, R. 2008. Assessing Participatory Development. Honours Dissertation. Department of Sociology, University of Cape Town.
- Njombi, W. 2006. Identifying and Measuring Participation: a Study in GAPA and SAHPF to Design and Test an Instrument to Gauge Participation. Honours Dissertation. Department of Sociology, University of Cape Town.
- Neuman, W. L. 2006. *Social Research Methods Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. USA: Pearson Education.
- Peet, R. and Hartwick, E. 1999. *Theories of Development*. New York: The Guilford Press
- Nwedamutswu, T. October/December 2008. Forward. In *Independent Development Trust Quarterly Programmes Bulletin*. P. Maja Eds. 1 (1): 2.

- Roodt, M. J. 1996. Participatory Development: a Jargon Concept? In *Reconstruction, Development and People*. J. K. Coetzee, & J. Graaff. Eds. Johannesburg: International Thomson Publishing.
- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey M. W., Freeman H. E., 2004. *Evaluation A Systematic Approach*, 2nd ed. London and New Deli: Sage Publications.
- Romm, R.A. and Flood. c1996. *Critical Systems Thinking: Current Research and Practice*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Schelder, A. 1999. Conceptualising accountability. In *The Self-Restraining State: Power and Accountabilty in New Democracies*. A. Shedler, L. Diamond and M. F. Plattner. Eds. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 13-29.
- Sen, A. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stoker, G., 2006, *Why Politics Matters: Making Democracy Work*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weiss, T.G. 2000. Governance, Good Governance and Global Governance: Conceptual and Actual Challenges. *Third World Quarterly*. 21 (4): 785-814.
- Weller, S.C. 1998. Structured Interviewing and Questionnaire Construction. In *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. H. R. Bernard. Eds. Walnut Creek, California: AltaMira Press London: Sage.

Background Interviews

- IDT Klapmuts Mud Schools Programme Managers. 2009. *Project and IDT Background Information Interview*. [Personal communication]. April 2009.
- IDT Regional Programme Manager. 2009. *Project and IDT Background Information Interview*. [Personal communication]. April 2009.
- Senior staff member at Klapmuts Primary School. 2009. *Project and School Background Information Interview*. [Personal communication]. April 2009.

University of Cape Town

Appendix A: Map of Klapmuts

CSIR Fundisadisk, (2009), includes material © CNES 2008. Distribution Spot Image S.A., France.



Appendix B: Benefits and Costs Involved in Using a Participatory Development Approach

Dauids et al. (2009: 19 -20) presents certain potential benefits and costs of using a participatory approach:

<i>Potential benefits</i>	<i>Costs and constraints</i>
Enhance beneficiary sense of ownership, belonging and acceptance of development activities towards sustainable development. (Khosa, 2000: 227)	Time and thus cost involved
Promoting the influence of the marginalised groups in decision making (Gran, 1983: 2)	The delay to starting projects
Promote acceptance of responsibility and thus self-reliance (Burkey, 1993: 40-70)	Participation might facilitate the surfacing of latent conflicts
Promote organisational capacity building and empowerment (Bryant & White, 1982: 15-16)	Increase in staff demands in a project
Promote the collection of accurate information reflecting relevant local needs by development initiative actors. (Van der Waladt & Knipe, 1998: 144)	Increase risk of certain groups/ interests taking over projects
Promote understanding of affordability and cost recovery.	Perceptions of elitism might follow as only some of the population participates

Appendix C: Question from the Interview Schedule that Informed the Final Set of Indicators

The following are the most useful questions in the interview schedule that pertained directly to the final indicators. The indicators can be identified as indicator **A - I**. All questions should be followed by probes asking for examples from the research context relevant to the processes in which the Targets are meant to be participating.

Question	Informs Indicator
1. Were the Targets informed of some, most or all of the decisions and actions in the programme? Please describe how you were informed.	A
2. Do the Targets have most of the decision making power in the programme? Who contributes to decision making processes? (Probe the involvement of the Target representatives.)	A – E, H, I
3. What are the rights and responsibilities of the Targets in the programme?	A - E, G - I
4. Who has the right to make suggestions about what activities need to be taken, and in what timeframe, to achieve the vision of the programme? Who actually made suggestions? Whose suggestions were used in the plan?	A – I
5. Who had the right to decided how the resources and money were to be used for these activities? Who actually decided? (Probe with questions about who manages the money in the programme.)	B, C, G – I
6. Were contractors hired for the programme, e.g. architects, builders, engineers etc? Who had the right to decide who would be given contracts in the programme? Who actually decided?	A – C, F - I
7. Would you say that the Outsiders do all the planning for the programme for the Targets of the programme? Do the Outsiders ask the Targets of the programme to approve the plans they have made?	C, F, H – I
8. Do the Targets have representatives on decision making committees? (If yes ask question 8.1. if no move to question 9.) 8.1. Can the Targets or Target representatives attend all of the meetings where decisions relating to the programme are made? 8.2. Do representatives feed the information they receive about the	C - F

programme back to the Targets?	
8.3. Do Targets give their ideas to the Target representatives? (If yes ask question 8.4. if no move to question 9.)	
8.4. Do you think the Targets' ideas are discussed in meetings that the representatives have with the outsiders?	
9. Do the Target representatives have full meeting access to all the meetings where decisions about the programme are made?	F

It is important to understand that these questions are not the best questions to inform the final set of indicators. These questions are taken from the original interview based on a much cruder set of indicators. An interview schedule should be designed that better inform the final set of indicators.

Appendix D: Hierarchical Coding System of the Data Display and Analysis Process

The terms parent, child and grandchild codes are used in the NVivo analysis programme to indicate the hierarchical relationship between codes. In this study each respondent is listed as a parent code. The six of levels of participation, (Informing, Consulting, Placation, Partnership, Delegated Power and Citizen Control), are child codes of the respondent parent codes. The indicators of each level are the grandchild codes.

The system is represented graphically on the following page. There are many respondents and more than two indicators for each of the levels. The coding system displayed is an illustration of the system used to code the transcripts of the interviews.

Parent
Code:
RESPON-
DENT

Child Code:
Level
Informing

Child Code:
Level
Consulting

Child Code:
Level
Placation

Child Code:
Level
Partnership

Child Code:
Level
Delegated
Power

Child Code:
Level
Citizen
Control

Grandchild
Code:
Indicator
one for the
level
Informing

Grandchild
Code:
Indicator
two for the
level
Informing

Grandchild
Code:
Indicator
one for the
level
Consulting

Grandchild
Code:
Indicator
two for the
level
Consulting

Grandchild
Code:
Indicator
one for the
level
Placation

Grandchild
Code:
Indicator
two for the
level
Placation

Grandchild
Code:
Indicator
one for the
level
Partnership

Grandchild
Code:
Indicator
two for the
level
Partnership

Grandchild
Code:
Indicator
one for the
level
Delegated
Power

Grandchild
Code:
Indicator
two for the
level
Delegated
Power

Grandchild
Code:
Indicator
one for the
level Citizen
Control

Grandchild
Code:
Indicator
two for the
level Citizen
Control

Appendix E: Excluded indicators and reasons for their exclusion

The following is a description of some examples of how the original indicators were refined or eliminated to create the final set of nine indicators used in the tool. The original indicators I developed to place the individual respondents on the ladder are written in *italics*. The final indicators are written in **bold**. Both these sets of indicators were developed from Arnstein's ladder

Informing

Outsiders have final veto is assumed throughout the levels except for the last level where Targets have final veto. To simplify the indicators it is assumed that outsiders have final veto unless otherwise mentioned. Only the indicator, **Targets have final veto in the programme**, will be used in relation to veto power and this indicator relates to the level of citizen control. According to Arnstein an element of the level of Informing is that the *only* form of participation is *that Targets are informed* of the basic progress and processes within the project. This indicator has been refined and reworded to create the indicator, **Targets are informed of programme processes**. This indicator not only supports the level of Informing but forms the basis of all of the levels. This refined system of indicators operates incrementally. This indicator, **Targets are informed of programme processes**, is applicable to all levels but if there are no other indicators of higher levels of participation and this is the only indicator that has supporting evidence then the respondent can be said to be situated at the level of Informing. The absence of other indicators shows that there is a one-way flow of information from outsiders to Targets.

One of the indicators of the level Informing was that *Targets are given minimal opportunities to ask questions*. This implies two-way communication. An essential element of this level is that only one-way communication exists from Outsiders to Targets. Arnstein's description of this element of the level of Informing is thus ambiguous. It was eliminated from being an indicator at the level of Informing.

It was difficult to collect meaningful evidence for the following original indicators of the level of Informing: *Information is given to the Targets of the project/program at a late stage of the planning* and *Meetings: the information given is*

superficial. Most of the evidence collected for these indicators was weak because respondents seemed to describe wishful thinking more than actual reflection on experiences. Depth of information and superficiality are very subjective relative concepts that change easily. These terms come directly from Arnstein (1969) but are not appropriate. The result is that only **Targets are informed of programme processes** is used to indicate this level of Informing.

Consulting

The indicator, *Despite best intentions, outsiders remain insensitive or unaware of the problems and aspiration of the Targets*, was left out because most of the results of this indicator were based on hear-say, were vague and prompted by broad assumptions. This indicator is not useful for a perceptual analysis but could be included if matching objective events and perceptions. The indicator, *Answers and information given by outsiders is too technical for Targets to understand or is irrelevant so Targets can't contribute meaningfully and might endorse plans without fully understanding or agreeing*, was hard to assess because respondents were not sure what the Targets fully understood the plans. Meaningful contribution was too much of an abstract concept – the responses received seemed contrived.

Other original indicators of this level, *There are not any Targets on decision making committees* and *Targets do not have representatives*, were combined into a single positive inclusive indicator of the level above, i.e. Placation: **Targets express their ideas about the plans to the outsiders through various channels and representatives at will**. If the perception is that the targets do not have representatives and can't express their plans to the Outsiders, the level perceived is below level of Placation.

The indicator, *The only form of participation of the Targets is that the Outsiders elicit opinions from the Targets*, is directly observable but it is restricted by the concept that it is the *only* form of participation. The wording of the indicator is confusing so I reworded it as follows: **Targets can only give their ideas and input to the project when asked to by the outsiders and their input is restricted to topics defined by the outsiders.**

The indicator, *Common methods of consultation include attitude surveys, neighborhood meetings, and public hearings* is not useful because any meeting can serve as an information session, consultation session or any of the higher levels of participation depending on the quality of the communication. This indicator was excluded from the tool. The indicators relating to the *inclusion of vulnerable groups* is difficult to get valuable subjective information about and was therefore excluded. The indicator *Target participation is measured by statistical abstractions* is not a good indicator of participation as statistics might be used because it is easily measured and useful for quick reporting and does not give any true reflection on the level of participation. This is not a strong, reliable measure of participation and was excluded.

Placation

The indicator of Consultation *There are not any targets on decision making committees and targets do not have representatives* was changed to a positive inclusive indicator **Targets express their ideas about the plans to the outsiders through various channels and representatives at will.** It is used at the level of Placation. This indicator is a combination of two indicators: *Targets contribute to planning or discussion through various channels and representatives at will* and *Targets have representatives on decision making committees.*

At the level of Placation the indicator *Outsiders do not offer assurance that targets' concerns and ideas will be taken into consideration* is not used because I found that in the field assurances and consideration are fleeting and soft concepts that are difficult for the respondents to give examples of and gauge. Outsiders might report that they take Targets' ideas into consideration, outsiders might think about or talk about targets ideas and this might be termed 'taking into consideration'. The results of this kind of taking into consideration process are more measurable and useful as an indicator but indicate a higher level of participation, i.e. Partnership. A more useful measure of the level of Partnership which includes Arnstein's accountability concepts described at this level is the indicator: **Targets demand accountability enforcement from the target representatives**. Targets have some degree of influence on the plans at this level. This does not occur at this level so this indicator would be in the negative 'not having' something, and would be confusing. The indicator *Target representatives offer limited accountability and/ or information to the targets* was refined to develop indicators of Partnership: **Targets demand accountability transparency from the target representatives** and **Targets demand accountability enforcement from the target representatives**.

Regarding the indicator, *Targets and Target representatives may give advice on boards or committees but outsiders judge the legitimacy of their advice and outsiders have final veto over the plans and policy*. Veto is part of another indicator and it is not necessary to repeat it. This indicator was eliminated.

The indicator *Targets and target representatives give substantial time and energy to the project without being able to influence the project or address root causes because of unclear structure, because they can't review plans in depth or initiate plans of their own or have enough time, resources or technical know how to address the root cause of the problem. Targets' contributions are thus not reflected in the final policy or plans for the program/ project*. This indicator can be condensed and reformulated to fit in with the **Targets demand accountability enforcement from the Target representatives** indicator as well as the indicator **Targets control specific and limited management and governance aspects of the programme**.

These are at higher levels of participation. Another problem with this indicator and motivation for it not to be used is that it's difficult for the respondent and the interviewer to unpack and distinguish between which ideas were originally the targets' and which were the outsiders'. Using the indicators in bold is a more reliable solution. The indicator *Targets do not have the financial control in the project*, is useful and measurable and was retained but was converted into a positive indicator: **Targets have control of a specific portion of the budget.**

The indicators *Targets 'rubber-stamp' or act as watchdogs of outsiders' plans, so committees approve plans outsiders have developed and participation requirements are not negotiated with targets* are elements of the indicator **Targets demand accountability enforcement from the target representatives.**

The indicator *The Outsiders give little or no thought to how targets would participate in the project implementation stage, so traditional agencies are usually envisioned to be the implementers and targets have minimal influence in this*, can be misleading in that Targets might be envisioned as part of the implementation plan but as labourers rather than participating in decision making. This does not provide a clear way to delineate between levels and was left out.

The indicator *Outsiders are condescending and paternalistic and respond bureaucratically to calls from the targets to be innovative* is not useful in a perceptual study as the Outsiders are not likely to see themselves as condescending.

Partnership

The indicator *Outsiders and Targets share planning and decision making power and negotiate differences with Outsiders before they endorse plans through joint policy and planning committees and Targets have full meeting access (to meetings that relate to decision making or planning)* can be included as an element within the indicator relating to **Targets demand accountability enforcement from the target representatives**. For this indicator Targets should have full meeting access. This was straightforward to measure.

Issues of *conflict and bargaining without Targets having final veto* relate directly to targets having some degree of power in decision making which relates directly to **Targets demand accountability enforcement from the target representatives**. It is not necessary and it is confusing to repeat indicators. For this reason the following indicator is not used, *Any conflict or differences in opinion between Targets and Outsiders needs to be resolved through bargaining process*.

The initial indicator *Target group has the resources and power to pay leaders, hire and fire organisers, technicians and lawyers so targets have bargaining power* is replaced with **Targets have control of a specific portion of the budget**. The indicator *problems are analyzed realistically in terms of strengths and weaknesses* is not useful because the term *realistic* is very subjective and evidence in the interviews was weak. This indicator was dropped.

Delegated Power

The indicator *Targets have specific, genuine powers and responsibilities within the project/ program and have a budget for this e.g. hiring and firing; issuing subcontracts for building, buying, or leasing* was replaced with the **Targets control specific and limited management and governance aspects of the programme**. Evidence was easy to collect regarding this indicator. The wording of the indicator was changed so as to make it more easily understandable.

Citizen Control

The indicator *Target groups have final veto power of the project and are held accountable for the project* is maintained and rephrased as **Targets have final veto in the programme.** This is the only indicator that separates the level of Citizen Control from the other levels. The indicator *targets participate to induce significant social reform* was an indicator of Citizen Control but it is difficult to measure over a short period of time and was dropped from the tool.

University of Cape Town

Appendix F: Consent Form

Interview with Mavourneen Street for the purpose of data collection in relation to her master's thesis in Development Studies at the University of Cape Town.

The interview will be recorded. These recordings will be kept secure by the interviewer. The recordings will be transcribed either by the interviewer or by trusted transcribers who will abide by the confidentiality terms as established with the interviewee. Raw data will be kept secure by the interviewer. The analysis of this data will be published in print format. Your name will not be released in the publication unless you grant me permission to do so. Information that you give me will not be discussed in association with your name unless you give me permission to do so. In interviews with more than one person at a time it will be agreed that each person respects the other's confidentiality.

Ivoluntarily consent to participating in this interview.

Sign..... Date.....

Appendix G: DoE Accommodation Schedule for Primary Schools

(Source: from Department of Education representative)

Accommodation

ACCOMMODATION SCHEDULE FOR PRIMARY SCHOOLS					
REQUIRED ACCOMMODATION			Amended : 04-06-2008		
SPACE USE CATEGORY		UNIT	NO. OFF	AREA / UNIT	TOTAL AREA IN SQUARE METRE (m²)
24	Media Office / Store	Rooms	1	8.00	8.00
25	Media apparatus store / workroom	Rooms	1	10.00	10.00
26	Computer room	Rooms	1	60.00	60.00
27	Handwork- / Art room	Rooms	1	70.00	70.00
28	H/work- / Art store	Rooms	1	12.00	12.00
29	Music Room	Rooms	1	70.00	70.00
30	Music store	Store	1	12.00	12.00
31	Forum	Learners	1120	0.50	560.00
32	Stage area		1	60.00	60.00
33	Boys cloakroom		1	20.00	20.00
34	Girls cloakroom		1	20.00	20.00
35	Feeding Kitchen		1	18.00	18.00
36	Food store		1	12.00	12.00
37	ABLUTION FACILITIES:				
38	Junior Boys	Rooms	1	40.00	40.00
39	Junior Girls	Rooms	1	40.00	40.00
40	Senior Boys	Rooms	1	45.00	45.00
41	Senior Girls	Rooms	1	60.00	60.00
42	Prefab : Junior Boys	Rooms	0		0.00
43	Prefab : Junior Girls	Rooms	0		0.00
44	Prefab : Senior Boys	Rooms	0		0.00
45	Prefab : Senior Girls	Rooms	0		0.00
46	Garden - / Sports equipment store	Store	1	12.00	12.00
47	Caretaker	Rooms	1	12.00	12.00
48	SUB-TOTAL : BUILDING AREA (excl. circulation and structure)				2,970.00
49	CIRCULATION & STRUCTURE:				
50	Circulation Approximately (Note : Foyer is part of circulation area)		22.00%	653.40	653.40
51	Structure Approximately		10.00%	297.00	297.00
52	TOTAL BUILDING AREA (incl. Circulation and structure)				3,920.40
53	SPECIAL SERVICES:				

Appendix H: Transcript of Outsider 6

Transcript of Interview Session

Interview Session Date: 20 July 2009

Respondent Outsider 6

I: Interviewer

O6: Outsider 6

Confidentiality explained and agreed upon. Confidentiality form signed.

I: I'd like to know about the minutes of the meeting that you had with ... with ... There was a meeting on the 4 of June.

O6: Umm ... I know there was a discussion ...umm. I do not think those meetings were minuted. It was just basically information sharing session.

I: That was between IDT, [throat clearing by G] the architect as well? Was it that that meeting on the 4th?

O6: No, the architect does not really attend those meetings.

I: Ok, what are those meetings? How regularly do you have those meetings between IDT and the Department of Education?

I: Probably once a month [I says ok]. Those meetings because the Education Department is our client so the things that get discussed there are the contractual things between the IDT and the Western Cape Education Department and it is not necessarily only project related issues. So that is why the professional team does not attend those meetings unless it is specifically requested by either ourselves or the education department. Uh things are discussed there is how the payment structure between the Western Cape education ... Education Department and ourselves are going to work ... uhm ... the signing of the contracts, our obligations, their obligations and things like that.

I: In terms of the contract and the memorandum of understanding, is there anything that relates to participation?

O6: Uhm ... [long pause] it's not really as much as detail as that and the MOU is now transferred into a principal agent agreement ... programme recommendation agreement... So it takes on a much more legal aspect than just a MOU ... uhm ... I think the participation and the community involvement is really as part of IDT's work ... uhm ... so it is part of our strategic objectives ... uhm ... the question that we always ask is ok so we've built a structure so

what. How has the community benefited uhm through the process uhm is there something that is sustainable and has come out from it? [hmm by M] other than just a new school in that regard.

A lot of our strategic objectives relate to local businesses, local suppliers, hmm ... local service providers in terms of building process, uhm Also community involvement that the community needs to at least have sort of input and buy-in to the whole process. Cause they have to give us acceptance of it at some stage. So we really structure our meetings in terms of a Steering Committee.

I: Which meetings?

O6: No, for the... our meetings for the project. The bi-weekly meetings or the meetings you have just mentioned No we have not started with that yet Oh no the bi-monthly meetings I mean

I: The bi-weekly meetings or the meetings you've just mentioned

O6: No, we have not started with that yet

I: Oh no the bi-monthly meetings I mean

O6: The bi-monthly meetings on site? That is the professional team meetings

I: So, which meetings are you referring to now?

O6: Uh, our monthly meeting that we will start establishing with the school governing body

I: Oh, so that has not taken place yet? What is the plan there?

O6: Well, the plan there is to use the students of the... school governing body as the steering committee which is going to link to how the community is going to be involved in the implementation process. Up until now we've been dealing with the planning phase, getting everything organised, getting approvals signed off, schedules and things like that

I: And deciding what exactly goes into the school?

O6: Ja, that's what we've been doing.

I: And in terms of the implementation and the school governing body, will that mean the contracting and the subcontracting of labour? Is that where the school governing body will come in?

O6: Yes, some of the labour, not all of the labour. Not all of the labour is going to come from the local area. I think ... well I'm still thinking of the percentages but probably 70% of the labour will be the contractor's own labour. We are going to try to ring-fence certain activities in the construction process.

I: And that's in the 1st phase of the activities of the 1st phase?

O6: We are going to ring certain activities in the construction period.

I: If you were to list only the external workers, groups coming in from the outside, that would not directly benefit from the project. They are involved in the project to help it operate or will be of some use to the project?

O6: That do not benefit from the end result or the end product?

I: The aim is not to benefit these people, these people help the project run like yourselves.

O6: Ok. I think definitely the professional team would be on that list. Uhm, the engineers, the architects, the engineers, the quantity surveyors. Well, they get payment and profit but they do not really benefit from their product itself, I mean the product.

I: Ja, it is not their needs that are being fulfilled.

O6: Ja, ja. Uhm [long silence]. I think certain types of local businesses do not benefit from it in terms of where we are. Most of the businesses that relate to the... environment will benefit over the short term ... uhm ... possibly some ...

I: For example?

O6: Building material suppliers, uhm small businesses like fencing, contractors, paving contractors.

I: Is that, are there ... have you done a kind of a needs assessment to understand uhm what uhm suppliers are in the area?

O6: No, that is where... will come in.

I: [IDT community involvement facilitator] will come in. Why has it not happened as yet?

O6: As yet we have been busy with the planning.

I: Ok

O6: A large, up to a certain amount of time ago the question was whether the project was to continue. Only up to recently was new funding made available for the new year.

I: Ok

O6: So we've been a lot on the back burner and the back foot of the project having designed the master plan but not really knowing how much money we were going to allocate to it. So that community or that facilitation process has been kept on the back burner.

I: And in terms of getting... [targets] involved in the design of the master plan?

O6: I think from my point of view his involvement in the masterplan is very minimal at the moment because of the fact that it is a technical sort of ... technical... It is based on a accommodation schedule which is based on providing an x amount of classrooms and x amount of this and the design is based on that which our client has now given us as a minimal ... as a minimal ... minimal ... specification. However even though... hasn't been involved, the accommodation schedule has been workshopped in the community...

I: Do you know of any specific meetings that the community gave their input at?

O6: I know in the parent – teachers association meetings that has been done, that has been given certain inputs has come through, competitions had been done.

I: There is the one where the kids had to draw.

O6: That is correct, ja.

I: And the parent-teachers meetings, do you know what exactly took place at those meetings?

O6: Just the one that I attended

I: Which?

O6: It's probably the one on the 9 of October. It was in October Uhm ... the school was presented but also possibilities of what it could be in terms of other schools and in terms of other educational institutions and what they have. And sometimes it was not necessary South African based

I: Ja, London pictures.

O6: London pictures. Just to give you an awareness of what could become or what could be created in this little, in this project. From there I think the, certain people could make input.

I: And did that happen?

O6: I would assume so yes.

I: Were you at the meeting?

O6: I was at the meeting, but I am not sure because [the architect] took over the adjudication of the drawings and the further input received from the meeting, that is something that he took in, and I trust that he build it into the design.

I: Ok, You were at the meeting that evening on the 9 October in the evening. Ok. Then [the architect] explained ... put up a projection of all the pictures and that. Following that what was the first thing that happened? And take me through step by step what happened at that meeting?

O6: Ok. What happened prior to that meeting I was not sure. That meeting was my first, my first view of the project itself as well. From there, I think, the awareness was created of the project and what it could, could entail.

I: Through those pictures?

O6: No, not necessary through the pictures also through the presentation itself. Many had a normal understanding of a school that is a building that is used from 8 to 2 o'clock just for learners. But I think at that meeting they got an awareness that we are building a facility that could be used elsewhere in the community and used for other things more than just a learning place where people learn, students learn. That it could really become a hub for community activity through early learning centres, through after hours learning for the parents and crèche facilities and things like that.

I: Ok, so community hub, educational facility as usual, like something beautiful like... ECD, adult education, these were all things that were presented by [the architect] that evening. Any other, now in terms of the community activities and the school as a hub of community activities, is this in line with the department of education's view?

O6: That's where we had to curtail the budget because for this particular project we actually went passed the scope of what was required. That is when the department of education made this accommodation schedule available and said, look for the funding it is nice to have some beautiful idea. Somewhere down the line we will probably do something like that but for Klapmuts right now we need 28 – 32 classes. So a lot of that thought process had to be curtailed because for right now the client wanted something basic.

I: And for your R5million that you contributed, couldn't you take those nice to have and run with them with your 5 million?

O6: No, the R5million is allocated for classrooms.

I: Ok, so it was specifically allocated?

O6: Of the R5million rand the Western Cape put to the project was part of I think either 50million rand nationally, that the IDT nationally made available for the... And I think the focus was classrooms.

I: Ok yes, so beyond the community hub, education facility, something beautiful ... ECD, Department of Education.... is there anything else that the architect pointed that this building would be?

O6: Uhm [long pause]

I: You can come back to this.

O6: Ja, I do not think anything else. But the greatest thing was that it took further the thinking from just a school building to something else. I mean for people to see that was good. Nobody ever thinks further than the school but

that their grounds could be used for activities and really and not only as a building but also the grounds, things like that, vegetable gardens, community gardens and things like that.

I: Now how much did the parents believe that this somehow was going to happen this way?

O6: I think the parents saw quite ... I believe that the school was going through a deep hole and they knew that the department of education has made some money available and the very fact that we did the presentation and that expectation was met.

I: And that they expect everything on here?

O6: I think they were made quite aware of the fact that it is what could happen.

I: Ok, was that quite clear?

O6: Yes, that was quite clear and that as far as possible as far as the budget will allow we will keep trying to create that.

I: Who made that clear though, the architects or the principal?

O6: Both of them, the principal did that but the presentation was really driven by the architect.

I: And was that in English?

O6 : Afrikaans.

I: Cause that's some ... the architect showed me the slides...

O6: The slides were in English but the explanation was in Afrikaans.

I: So architect presents all these things and then he talked about ... what was the next step? In the meeting.

O6: Oh, in the meeting? I think the next step was the IDT and the professional will go ahead and plan these things. And also introducedyes , but also the art competition and input that be given out there. Then [the architect]could adjudicate and include some of the input from the meeting into the design.

I: The ... so the art competition was included, was announced, that was announced at the school, the professional team was introduced?

O6: No, they did not have the full professional team at the time. It was just the principal agent and the IDT.

I: Ok, and then, how was the input asked for? [long silence]

O6: Was [the architect] asked for a show of hands ... the reason why I'm asking you is because it was a year ago. I've also asked some other groups and everybody will remember different pieces. I remember a show of hands.

I: Ok

O6: It is a good question, how was the input gathered, uhm ...

I: Cause I understand that the parents that I asked and the teachers, everybody can remember little snippets. If I can put all the snippets together then I can have a better picture.

O6: Well I think I do not remember that part

I: You do not remember?

O6: [silence] I sort of remember that because an opportunity not only at the meeting but after the meeting as well where people could view the plans and actually could chat to the architect. And I think the plans were show-cased on a poster or board and afterwards parents at the meetings could asked questions from the architect and at that stage the comment could be active for this and I think that input was captured, should have been captured by [the architect].

I: Did you take part in those conversations?

O6: I was dealing more with people asking for work. [laugh] A lot of people came to me and said that they do, they supply cement and that they would like to be part of this, or they supply bricks or they supply labour. So that is where my focus was. But at that point the community could still wonder and look at the drawings and that.

I: I just want to make sure that the community did give input.

O6: I really do not know.

I: Ok, I understand. And then who was at the meeting?

O6: From whose side?

I: Oh, so, the architect, IDT, yourself, architect's assistant?

O6: Yes

I: And from the .. there were teachers?

O6: There were teachers, that was on the parents-teachers meeting evening

I: Ok

O6: So all the teachers were there, all the parents were there and then from the meeting they could then go on and do their other business, their parent-teachers business.

I: Anybody else from the community besides the parents teachers?

O6: No, not that I know of.

I: Any kind of businesses?

O6: Being just a parents-teachers meeting, I do not think that there were businesses there.

I: OK.

O6: The odd business person who contract was there was probably someone with children who are attending the school and they just saw an opportunity to come to me after the meeting to find out if there were possibilities for work. And I think our answer to them was that there will be another drive at a later stage where specifically businesses, or potentials around suppliers could be sourced and that there is where the student, the governing body will work with together with them.

I: And in terms of the tendering of buildings, I do not know if that was handled by the other contractor, the other project managers. [O6 says no] Were they not involved in that meetings and that they use labour from the community at all, do you know?

O6: You see the temporary classrooms that were installed. First of all there were temporary classrooms previously and new ones were installed. There then became a game of... because the block has now been demolished. The block that was earmarked to be demolished was in a better condition than that block that would have been occupied. So the principal then occupied the block that was meant to be demolished. Again the whole contractor project regarding the new temporary... was handled by education through their projects management unit which is... based in Cape Town. And IDT was not part of that.

I: So in terms of the community being involved in terms of getting work there?

O6: I do not think so, I do not think so that anybody could work?

I: Did you hear any complaints about that?

O6: No, I didn't hear any complaints about that. So the contractor that was used was... and these guys come out in mass and then prepare the ground and then install the classrooms.

I: And so it was the aim of that meeting, as far as I understand, to inform people? Was there any other aim of that meeting.

O6: I think that was it, to inform people and to create awareness of what was going on. I think prior to that there were rumours that the school was going to be revamp, people didn't know so we just took the opportunity to inform the teachers and the parents there ... that uhm... these were the issues regarding the new school. We also gave people an opportunity, I like to call it a gripe session. Teachers could say their frustration with the current school and could highlight areas of danger. Ok. The floor had been rotten.

I: Was this after the presentation?

O6: At the meeting, during the presentation.

I: So, during, while [the architect] was talking about all this stuff.

O6: Yes

I: Ok

O6: The floors were rotting, the children could fall through. The things that were highlighted were the conditions, the buildings itself. Uhm, the condition of the ground. Uhm, being water logged in winter and out of that a few notes that we did make was that we could realise that, as part of the project we needed to look at surface drainage. The fact that the water was so deep that the children could drown. I think we just need that much of water for us to drown. Those little problems were earmarked and highlighted.

I: Do you have any notes that you made from the meeting?

O6: No, not now [laugh] anymore.

I: Ok. So the water drainage was a problem.

O6: The drainage was a problem. The existing structures being unsafe, I think not from that meeting but from subsequent meetings we actually got the Department of Public Works out to look at the buildings and I think the buildings were condemned. As a result of our, as part of our drive to get extra funding, the extra funding for the new year only came through I think 2 months ago. Prior to that the department of education made clear that there wasn't extra funding available so we were just looking at the R5million made available by the IDT and the R8 or 18 or 80... million of education department.

I: What helped drive or getting that extra funding?

O6: I think we did a conditions' assessment of the school.

I: What drove the conditions... why did you come to that point? Who was involved?

O6: To motivate for extra funding.

I: Who was involved in that?

O6: Uh the school was involved in that, the school had employed its own health and safety agent.

I: Is that Mr...

O6: Who's that?

I: ...

O6: No

I: Ok, he needn't ask [principal] he went outside and got extra help.

O6: Yes, by that time we had already employed an engineer. He then also instructed the conditional assessment.

I: [The principal]

O6: [The principal] and you know we tried to build up the reports in terms of historically. I think the first conditions assessment was done a year or two ago. We had that information and we had a conditions assessment done now and we could measure the rate of deterioration. And on the strength of these two report in the meeting where the Department of Public Works' officials came out to sign together with the Department of Education's officials to do a work about on site and at that time the, the, this block that we are demolishing right now was condemned. It could not be used and as evidence we submitted these reports to Education to say we really need the extra funding now because the funding we do have is not really going to cover the needs of the school. Uhm... we, our design is based on a master plan. We got a phased construction and we would like to finish the school in terms of having everyone around the table at one given point. Let's not break the momentum, let's finish the school if the extra funding was made available.

I: So the assessment that was done a year ago was prior to IDT's involvement.

O6: Prior to IDT's involvement.

I: So there was a big drive for a common arrangement between IDT and the department to get extra funding.

O6: That's correct... And you can see from the results of the assessment the rate of the deterioration was quite significant.

I: I'm sure. And then in terms of that meeting again, were people, certain questions were asked by [the architect]. What was the response? Can you remember any of the questions that were actually asked?

O6: [Long silence] You, I know he asked, was everybody happy with what they've seen and the response was a unanimous yes.

I: How did they indicate that they were happy.

O6: I think someone clapped and there were whispers saying yes and then general murmurs and that.

I: Did he ask for suggestions?

O6: [Long silence] I do not know about that specifically.

I: Do you know if there were any prior needs assessments done or do you know whether there were any needs assessments...

O6: I, not in the community maybe in terms of the school.

I: Were there any questions you can remember?

O6: No [silence]. I think the one question was about what about the current school would you like to change? Uhm... and the responses from the teachers at the time...

I: Was that the gripe session?

O6: Ja. They were like I've said, safety was an issue, the, the thermo quality, the temperature and the cold. Lighting was an issue, uhm ... and also up till what level of education could one get a school. I know the school was at standard 7 or 8...

I: Ja, 9.

O6: 9 or so. A lot of the questions after that was more to do about the school and the logistics around the schooling. Is there going to be language classes in terms of Xhosa and how we going to accommodate the Xhosa speaking students and how are we going to accommodate the English speaking students and things like that. So some of the comments moved away from the actual school work towards the governing body and things like that.

I: And were there any complaints about the presentation that were given out on that night?

O6: No. The community were very calm.

I: And were there no Xhosa speaking person who was there?

O6: No. Uh, I think there might have been one or two that did ask that next time there would be a Xhosa speaking interpreter or something.

I: Was there any tension in the meeting or anything that you picked up?

O6: No, nothing that I picked up. I think everybody was just happy that the project is now under way

I: And you think that from that do you think that people thought of some things that they would of liked to have said in that meeting, was there an opportunity for them to raise that?

O6: Yes, I think there was an opportunity for them to raise things.

I: After the meeting though.

O6: Yes, after the meeting and even during the meeting. It was an interactive session.

I: And after the meeting what was in place? What channels were put in place for a parent that after the meeting might have said "oh something I should have said?" What channels are there to get those people...

O6: At this stage it is basically through the principal.

I: Ok then, so you noted of some, you just gave me examples of some of the things that were generated. Were any suggestions discussed? So was the drainage and the safety discussed?

O6: I think it was raised and then supported by the people and you know the discussion was just reaffirming it is an important issue. At this point you know three or four people were saying "yes I agree with what's happening, this is an important issue" and possibility then we take note of it.

I: What do you mean, who came up with the possibilities and the solutions.

O6: For example, if someone raises the fact that the classrooms are cold, someone else would get up and say I agree because my son keeps on coming home with a sniff or something like that. And you get a number of people agreeing to the same point. Then I will make a note to say special attention to the thermo aspect of the school.

I: Was the solution discussed or did you note that?

O6: No, the solution wasn't discussed at that stage and we will be out of our design if we make an allowance for that.

I: And at that meeting were the targets given and the assurances that there were issues being addressed?

O6: Yes.

I: In what form would those be addressed?

O6: By just [the architect] and the principal say, sort of selling the ownership of the school... this is your school, we heard what you say some kind of thing. We would like to incorporate it and there would be some follow up afterwards and there will be a meeting afterwards.

I: Uhm, so they have not actually seen some of their ideas realised yet because I mean the project hasn't...

O6: They will notify of any changes.

I: Whose idea was to build the temporary classes?

O6: It wasn't really an idea it was a necessity based on the fact that the block that would of remained and service was not occupied so it became a necessity to find accommodation.

I: But the principal went and occupied a block that was a necessary accommodation?

O6: Ja... the school was divided into two blocks [silence] H in the middle and it was just the front block that was going to be demolished. The back block was going to be occupied. Then it turned out that the front block that was going to be demolished was in a better condition than the one to be occupied.

I: Uhm, I think the reason why originally in the implementation plan were going to demolish in phases and to do the 1st phase the first block would be demolished. When we got onto the project a block had already been vacated and new temporary classrooms were already set up and they were already been used. That's when the conditions assessment came about and the principal then took the decision ok because extra classrooms were not available he was going to move the students into this one and the ... ja ... sort of forced the hand of the education department.

I: Was it enough information for people to understand or too much or too technical?

O6: I remember my feeling at the meeting was at the time uhm, I think that the presentation was too much information uhm, I I wasn't really in favour of showing the pictures of London schools and you know how best, best describe a school like Julliard and music schools you know, I wanted the presentation to be more relevant to the community and I felt at the time that it could have created expectations which I knew for a fact government never meets [laughs]. I think it was a bit too much information. A lot of the presentation sounded like a wish list for me.

I: What do you mean by that?

O6: It sounded like the whole thing was so nice, it good to creating a concept that the school will look like that, glass facade, really just going overboard in terms of architectural flare. I thought it became a wish list it should be a nice to have but my feeling at the time was okay, they creating a perception that people are going to expect in reality and being new to the project my question was is the reality going to reflect what we are saying, Ja.

I: In terms of that wish list did the parents help create that wish list?

O6: No, I do not think that parents did not create that wish list. I do not think they knew too much about the project before that but the architect was the one who brought this picture. At the time I thought it was a bit too much.

I: Any other comment about the depth and whether people really understand what's going on?

O6: I think that people understand what's going on. You do get the odd person that really cannot picture two dimensions into three dimensions, perhaps a model would of being better. It is really difficult to place how people understand these things.

I: And in terms of uhm, the meetings that you having bi-monthly... now who attends the meetings?

O6: Most of the meetings at this stage are professional team meetings, sort of planning meetings at the moment.

I: So why are the teachers there?

O6: Well, the principal is one of the stakeholders and I think he selected those teachers to select him in the process. I think those teachers are part of his small project team. At times they are welcomed to sit in and just listen to the progress. But there meetings outside of that where the professional teams will discuss. For example, tomorrow we have meetings just for the professional teams. Uhm, ja.

I: Ok, so is there a difference in aim when the teachers are there and when the teachers are not there?

O6: Then we talk pure technical in terms of conditions of contract, talking elements of finishing, relationships between professional team members. It could get a bit too technical and too high for the teachers to understand.

I: And could conditions of contract include kind of participation, how many people from the community are employed and kind of that. Perhaps if you have to choose perhaps some choices like, whether there is going to be grass or paving and whether there either going to be cloak rooms or some of the other choices. Those various aspects of the school, the amount of toilets...

O6: Well those kinds of aspects are governed by the accommodation schedule. Our client takes our drawings and measures them in terms of the department's accommodation schedule and then if we sort of exceed even in square metre area questions are asked. So ultimately the end product is then [silence] I would say be the Public Works who is the custodian of the building and the structures. Uhm... in terms of maintainability they have set up these accommodation schedules so we try to abide as much as possible to this in terms of our design... You see the accommodation schedule governs what there needs to be for a primary school of a certain amount of pupils. And it actually tells you how many of item you need to have. So I do not think we can really deviate from this. You could probably get more but not less. It is not

something that you can say you can just, ok I'm not gonna give this but I'm going to give more of that.

I: And who, who takes part in those decisions, if you know what I mean, between these two meetings where there are teachers and where there are teachers? Where does the decisions being made around the number of toilets and where there is ECD centre in phase 1 or phase 2?

O6: Neither that. I think that decision gets made between the education department and the IDT.

I: Ok. The targets do not participate in that decisions, from what you've seen?

O6: Not from what I've seen.

I: Ok, and from what you've seen in terms of the library and in terms of the learning centre, the IT room those... who did those ideas come from...

O6: It is a large frame accommodation schedule but the design and size really came from the architects understanding. Again the, this document was given to the architect, he designed along as best as what he could. I think and I believe that the design and the size, the computer lab and the library only the design and the size came from the architect.

I: So the actual suggestion to have a library and a computer lab, did that come all from the principal?

O6: [silence] It could have come from early interaction between the principal agent and the principal in terms of what was needed. Must of being before my time but I know that the principal did have a say in what he would have, media centres and things like that. But I also believe that he worked from a document like this. [Noise of paper being picked up.] He would have known of the existence of documents like this.

I: And target would mean people from the community whose needs would be met through the project and they according to you would be...?

O6: According to me they would be the parents of the students, certain community leaders, people who use the hall and things like that.

I: So it's the learners, high school kids, are they will use the library and the computer lab?

O6: Ja, that's up to the governing body to decide that – whose going to use the library and the lab.

I: Cause as far as I understood when there's a shift in the funding so some things are being removed for now. [G says ja.] How have those decisions been made, decisions been made what has to be taken off for now?

O6: Well, there's a core outcome of the, of the, the project for the IDT and its funding is that there needs to be class rooms. There is a core outcome for the

department to have a refurbished school. So there are some items in our design that can be deemed excessive. Based on the funding, this is what I'm trying to produce. Our current design is little bit more than this. Trimming the fact that we trying to... On a regular basis we have our quantity surveyor. He gives us a list of schedules and possible cost of the project with each design change and if we find that something needs to be cut because we are over budget, then we try to stick to this, this is the budget we have and what is nice to have in terms of size, in terms of finishings with materials that we going to use, that gets trimmed.

I: What has been dropped?

O6: Well I think so far, most recently being some of the finishings, I think the finishing of the room was changed from concrete to something else. Each classroom had a build teacher's closet that had to be removed.

I: Whose idea was that?

O6: To remove?

I: To have a build in teachers' closet.

O6: That came about from [the architect].

I: Ok.

O6: I was not very happy with this. Each classroom had a [inaudible] built into the wall which had a cost associated to it. It was picked up by the education department, [Department of Education representative] and they sort of told us that [inaudible] that each teacher has a cabinet and the build in was not necessary. Uhm... so ja...

I: So the, so was the cut down by trimmings ... what the roof looks like and the cupboards

O6: The materials used in the construction, the roof I think was also being cut. Some of the landscaping aspect.

I: The community gardens?

O6: Not just the community gardens but also the paving areas and the parking areas. Possibly the next thing to be cut will be the size of the media centre, and your library, the school through its accommodation only need about 60 square metres and currently we are at 300 square metres. We probably need to cut down the size of that, we probably will make the front portal look a little bit different. That where I leave it up to [the architect] to minimize the effect of our cutting.

I: And who took part in the decisions as to what should be cut?

O6: Uhm ... its Eu.... its the IDT and the education department.

I: So the school governing body, and the teachers, the principal won't take part in that discussion on what will be cut. And is there any intention to let them take part in what needs to be cut?

O6: They not funders, they cannot cut. At the end we have to produce a product that is complete. We will try to accommodate their design, I think some of the, [the IDT representative]... does inform the principal of what the latest developments are. But unless they are funding the project...

I: In terms of who... what I understand is that some things are cut but other things are retained. So in terms of the choice between what's cut and what's retained, its just the IDT and the department of education that makes the decision?

O6: Ja, we also take it on advisement from our quantity surveyor and our professional team. We cannot cut and replace with other things. We have to cut where it makes the least amount of pain.

I: Amount of pain. What do you mean?

O6: Where it affects our construction, it affects the look of the school, affects what eventually – all the participation that we've done has resulted in the master plan. So we try and cut so that the design or the functionality of it that was agreed by everybody is not impacted too much. So we would much rather change the type of a door than to remove a store room or a classroom totally. Or we change the material to bring in a certain element than take the element out.

I: Are there any major decisions that targets are not privy to?

O6: Not privy [long silence] No, I do not think so. I think that is one of the reasons why we got Mr. Frans and some of the teachers in the meetings so that they are also along in the journey. I think he is aware of what we are going to do and what we can do. I think he is also aware of some of the extra things that we have in mind. There might not be money for community gardens but we have approached other organisations to assist us with that. Uhm, ja.

I: Allraait, so those in the meetings the bi-monthly meetings, can you give an example from the targets' side. Were everybody given an opportunity to talk?

O6: They give input when there are points of discussions and sometimes their suggestions are best known because they know the community. And they know what, they sort of give us the heads up because they know what to expect. And ja, they, they have input in terms of the plans....

I: And can you give an example of where they put things on the table that wasn't on the agenda before?

O6: [long silence] Uhm, I know the principal has been quite invaluable in terms of the community awareness and he requested that when the demolition is completed a function would be held where the community would

be part of it. I know that the teachers assisted us in terms of security for the place.

I: This is one of the teacher- security company?

O6: It was one of the teachers that help us source meetings with the right people.

I: And at these meetings, do they relate to the targets concerned, that relates to the programme. Is the information not too technical?

O6: Ja. I think you had sufficient detail, because it is a smaller group everybody can be made to understand where the meeting is going to and I suppose the school gave representatives an opportunity to ask questions where they answered.

I: And did you, in terms of that, did the principal ever say, this is a concern from the parents, or was it always him talking about concerns? Or did he ever made it clear that it wasn't his but the teachers or parents' concern?

O6: If he did I didn't notice, ok.

I: Cool. And do you know about the teacher's drawings? The teachers apparently were asked to make drawings of what they wanted their classrooms to look like...

O6: It must of only being between the teachers and [the architect]

I: Ok. Cool. And then you discuss now, who were the other we discussed the targets are. And in terms of the message that you sent to the DoE... were the major issues that you needed his approval on?

O6: Uhm, basically the specifications and the cost. His main focus was that whatever you present needed to cover the cost. And the accommodation schedule needed to be adhered to. That is what our approach has been.

I: What do you see as participation? Let's start with that one.

O6: [silence] Uhm ... I think that one is interesting. To ask what participation was but ja. In most aspects for me participation is the community involvement in your project, in what ever you work, uhm, the idea of coming in someone's backyard and building something is not right. The community participation would be making people feel part of a process and also at the end of the process making it sure that they they sustain it for themselves. Uhm, that is participation can be from the community and could be from the community leaders, forums that are in the area, but I think participation, that is why i asked you what do you mean, because the stakeholders are also participants in the process, Jakoert is also participant in the process. Uhm ... I think

I: And do you mean that to be a part in terms of decision making or in the process. How a part?

O6: I would say everybody gets informed, a few parties get instructed, and even fewer give input.

I: And who gets informed? If you had to look at your list of parents, community leaders, people who use the hall, learners, teachers. Of them, who gets informed, instructed and what was the third one. Who makes decisions. Is it in part make decisions or actually?

O6: Make decisions in part.

I: Who fits in these three, so far, what's your impression.

O6: Uhm, I think a lot of the end users, they get informed and they give input. I would say, the learners, the teachers, and the school administrators.

O6: Instructed I would say, is more the contractors and the suppliers because your agreement with them is more contractual and is more legal based. So, they would fall in that category and the people who make decisions is different role players, the funders, the Department of Education, the IDT, uhm ... I would assume there is some local bodies in the Klapmuts area. [I saying from what you've seen.] That is where [IDT community involvement facilitator] would be part... Coming from my background I would be more civic organisations, like SANCO.

I: What you have given me here, in terms of the procedural during the implementation stage, but we also talk about the decision making stage.

O6: The decision making stage would be the Department of Works, Education, IDT, ja... and there are other role players.

I: Ok, and so if I read out some of the sentences, and these are some of the ways in which people can participate and can be involved, can participate. So be informed of all of the decisions, being informed of most of the decisions and actions or all of the decisions and actions... and that sort of things? Be able to do some work in the project? Giving opinions regarding some of the work and actions? Having assurances that those decisions and actions or that those opinions will be implemented? Having representatives that will implement their decisions and actions or having those assurances or not. Shared decision making power and then having the decision making power to instruct Outsider in terms of what they must or mustn't do.

O6: Ja, its fine.

I: Ok, so being informed of decisions and actions to some extent or all the time?

O6: In terms of what is pertinent for them.

I: For example and to who? So parents, principle?

O6: In terms of your design of the team and the principles and the usage of the school or you would inform the people that are going to be using it the

relevant information. The information would be filtered because a lot of the decisions and activities do not concern them.

I: Who is them? Which of the them?

O6: The users, the teachers, the parents, the...

I: The principal as well?

O6: ... well, to a certain extent the principal yes, but on a different level. Uhm, because the way I understand all the decisions and activities, between the IDT and the education department to whose paying what funds, how the funds would be paid to the IDT. All those that are decisions right up ("on their behalf" inaudible), The information has to be filtered in terms of ...

I: In terms of their ... what of the needs that these groups have in this project, what needs have been fulfilled? Of the parents needs that they have of this project, what needs have been fulfilled?

O6: I think the parents needs are a safe environment for their children to learn, to get the best education for their children that they can, a need for them is also their facility where they can even further their own education and use the facility. Uhm ... probably a sense of community pride that their school is now becoming a social hub in the area. From a principal and teachers' point of view would be up to date facilities where they can do their work and ensure that the students can be taught in the same comfortable environment.

I: And as you go through this if you can emphasise their rights, roles and responsibilities towards the project.

O6: Oh, ok. Uhm ... in terms of the rights, they've got the right to access (I: who is they?) They are the students and the teachers and the principal, admin staff, they got the right to access to the facility. They should probably ensure the benefits of it.

I: And in terms of the process, and roles?

O6: I think their role would probably be to filter in information to what their minimum requirements are and even some of their nice to have's and to accommodate that.

I: Who are they?

O6: The principal or the students, students, admin staff.

I: To filter through whose needs?

O6: They need to filter through the design team. I think the role that they also have to perform will have to support the process.

I: How do the actors support the decision making process?

O6: By accepting it. Uhm ... ja.

I: And in any way that they have a role, right and responsibilities in terms of the decision making process? Any other way that they have roles, rights or responsibilities in terms of the decision making process?

O6: Not that I know of no.

I: Uhm ... and then how do you feel about how they participated so far in the project?

O6: I think they done well so far, In the beginning they were quite vocal about their requirements at the meeting ... [I: Who were?]. The students ... the teachers about their safety and how concerned they were for their own and for the students' safety. And I was glad for that. And maybe some of the comments that filtering through the principal will also try to accommodate.... and from the reports, informal reports and informal discussions they said they are happy with what they have seen.

I: Informal discussions with whom?

O6: When you walk past and stuff like that.

I: Principal or teachers?

O6: It's teachers, I assume they are teachers, I'm not sure who is teacher and who is not, but they seem to be quite happy.

I: And if they want change to the current thing, who do they go to. And if they not happy, who are they going to, are there channels?

O6: Via the principal.

I: So that's your one trusted channel.

O6: For now, and then the school governing body would be the steering committee where all this would filter through.

I: But not for decision making that's for the implementation stage.

O6: Implementation, and possible for suggestions. It's not that every single suggestion can be incorporated. We have to evaluate the suggestions and determine whether it has merit in the greater picture.

I: Any examples of suggestions that have been incorporated and some that has been rejected?

O6: No.

I: So there did you get that kind of thought from?

O6: That's just my, that's how I see it. Uhm ... not every suggestion can be accommodated because there is an end result that we have to follow through.

I: There is no example or times when you thought of this ...

O6: Not in this project, no.

I: What is the main project vision?

O6: I think the main project vision would be to provide a facility that again can be used by learners and the community alike. My vision would be bring in the same quality, cost and time that we agreed on and really through participation and hopefully community's involvement to make it self sustaining.

I: And ... is this overall vision or is this your vision or who's vision is it that you have just described.

O6: It's the vision and I would assume that this is my vision [laugh].

I: Are there different visions in the project?

O6: I would say there are different end results, depends from which side you come. I would say if I were the department I would be thinking the social impact and how the community would benefit. Coming from the technical, my vision is to get the thing into the ground and bolted and ready. So a lot of my focus is not necessarily based on the social and the humane aspect but the human side of things. My measurement is getting it in and erected and according to spec and all I do is I attempt to manage the other aspects of it as well with the help of people from Allan's department because that is their forte.

I: There a number of places that you can trim and you need to choose which to trim – how do you chose?

O6: [long silence]... Maybe and maybe not. [laughs] Not as clear cut, I think we ... the choice is not whether you can do something either or the idea is how can be keep from everything as much as possible. So the choice of cutting and limit replacing other, it would be how can... we cut both elements so that we ensure functionality is not eliminated but that both are present.

I: In terms of the reasons for certain things being there. The reasons for a cafeteria and the reasons for a big kitchen... do you have a clear understanding of the targets' reasons for wanting those things

O6: I think we do

I: How did you establish this?

O6: Again we are governed by the accommodation schedule

I: Do you think people are satisfied wit the level of participation?

O6: [Long Pause] I would say 80% of the people are. No matter how much participation you give there's always a few that need more.

I: We have discussed rights and responsibilities. What are your rights and responsibilities in the project as the IDT or personal?

O6: [Long pause] I think our rights and responsibilities are really temporary. At this stage it is the responsibility to ensure that the work is completed and funded. I'm not too sure what the future plans of sustaining the work that we've done is and I'm hoping that that element would come through on more of a social side with assistance programs and things like that in the community.

I: Are there targets in each of these groups that represent their interests? Principal, teachers, learners, people who use the hall, learners and children?

O6: That is where the school governing body would come in

I: Historically now?

O6: Historically, no

I: Who does the principal represent?

O6: He represents the school, the students and the teachers

I: So is he the main guy who is representing their needs? And those four other teachers

O6: Ja and I think they some of the authority is delegated to the other four teachers as well

I: And do you know how they were chosen? Why are they there not somebody else?

O6: No I do not know

I: And are they aware of the process, what are the plans, like who will be involved in which way, are for the how the teachers and the parents would be involved in the project?

O6: No I do not think so. I think they have been told about the long term processes the block with demolished and the school be constructed by this and this day but the nuts and bolts of the process I do not think they really know...

I: Any other committees...so ok the school governing body hasn't been involved yet?

O6: not much no

I: What would you call those bimonthly meetings that you have?

O6: I would call it a progress meeting for now

I: Progress meeting ... and would you call that a committee?

O6: That would just be a professional team it wouldn't be a committee

I: So it's the professional team pluss the 4 teachers

O6: Ja ... See that bi-weekly meeting is a forerunner of the monthly steering committee meeting I suppose the vision would be at a later stage to include the school governing body and possibly then some of the teachers that are representing the school will also then phase out and be replaced by school governing body members with the principal IDT would be present there and the DoE would be present more and that becomes the steering committee for the project and then you've got the technical steering committee outside of that who will deal with the technical issues.

I: It seems like some decisions get made here and others there...

O6: The decisions are not interrelated the technical committee would be making construction decisions... how much concrete arrives... because then we would have to meet with the contractor and manage the construction based on with input from the steering committee. I mean there will be certain questions asked in terms of safety in terms of noise... pollution

I: So what kind of big decisions can the construction committee make outside of the steering committee?

O6: Very little because we are governed by the approved plan and the implementation plan

I: So there is the pre-steering committee. There is the school governing committee. And you're not sure of their involvement?

I: What has the School Governing Body's purpose been thus far?

O6: Thus far it has been as it has always been to manage the school

I: And in terms of the project?

O6: Oh in terms of the project

I: Any purpose so far?

O6: No purpose so far

I: Any responsibilities, tasks or rights that the school governing body had in terms of the project?

O6: Not in the past

I: Who has the rights and responsibilities to decide what actions need to be taken in what time-frame.

O6: In the school? I think that is a decision that needs to be taken in communication with the department of education the principal and public works.

I: And yourselves?

O6: Our rights is short lived as long as we are involved in the project we have certain rights but as part of the end product we do not really have too much of a say.

I: Who has the final say over those decisions?

O6: About what the school is used for?

I: About the activities – what classrooms need to be built, how big must they be...

O6: Oh those type of activities, those are IDT activities. IDT will make the decisions.

I: The final decisions

O6: Yes

I: OK and then who has the right to change or adapt plans?

O6: It will probably be either IDT or the Education Department

I: So it's not the teachers or the principal?

O6: No

I: And can you think of any examples where the outside workers so this is the outside agent's ideas or suggestions were rejected or changed by the targets?

O6: [long pause] I think that process might have been ongoing in minor situations

I: Can you think of any examples

O6: Not that I know of no

I: Do you know any examples of who is responsible for doing physical work for the project, like making phone calls or organising meetings

O6: That's in the appointment of the principal agent

I: So that all the architect

O6: Ja

I: Who has the right to decide how resources and money are to be used for the activities

O6: IDT and Education Department

I: Did the targets have decision making power in terms of they will have this and they will have that?

O6: [long pause] at the very beginning I think they had the power to make a decision and influence the way the design has taken place.

I: Any examples of that?

O6: Um well they might have had the opportunity I'm not sure if they exercised their rights to do that

I: Do you think that the targets expect some things that they are not going to get?

O6: I think so

I: And has that been dealt with in terms of communication with them about that

O6: No, not that I know, no

I: And do you think that people are scared to voice their opinions?

O6: Yes.

I: Why?

O6: Traditionally... if you look at the community (the architect) being a fair skinned person... the option is... the idea is always... they fear giving their opinion to someone who is white. I think the IDT representative was at the first one which is why he also had to give a presentation.

I: Do you think that they were at all afraid that if they say something that that's going to stop the process?

O6: No, I do not think they were afraid of that. It's some sort of shyness or issue that people have based on the previous history

I: Do you know of any disagreements between the external workers and the targets of the project?

O6: No.

I: Do you think that the targets know about all the visions and activities and the processes for the project?

O6: I think they know the broad issues the high level processes that things have to be broken down and built I'm certain that they have seen activity

I: Are there any other ways in which the targets are informed of what is going on? Are they sent letters...

O6: No

I: So as far as you know is it just through that one meeting

O6: through the principal and through that one meeting

I: And do you know through what channel the principal feeds the information back to the targets?

O6: At some stages he will probably use the students who will pass information to their parents. We are going to use some of the local newspapers when we eventually present what is going to happen. And again the parent teachers meetings. That's the only time when we get people in one room type of thing

I: Who does the project belong to in terms of the process. I am going to ask you two questions. Who does the process belong to and finally who does the process belong to. The end product...

O6: The end product belongs to...well the department of public works would be the custodian and see to the management and maintenance of the end product. The implementation there of is now the IDT and the client which is the education department.

I: So the process of the project belongs to the IDT and the Education department?

O6: Yes

I: So where the targets' opinions were asked was at that big meeting in October and then at that meeting on the 4th of June?

O6: Yes

I: And then at the bi-monthly meetings asking the opinions of the teacher representatives

O6: Yes

I: And are opinions actively asked for at those bi-monthly meetings?

O6: Not necessarily asked for but opportunity is given for anybody to say anything because as you know it's relatively informal

I: Do you have any examples where targets gave their opinions or expressed concern about the project

O6: No

I: Who has the right to decide to whom contracts are awarded?

O6: The IDT

I: So the what are the reasons it is not given to the targets to decide?

O6: They need an independent body because we are dealing with public finance and the IDT subscribes to the BFMA

I: So who deals with or manages how those tax resources are spent.

O6: Well it's governed by the BFMA and our head office and the CFO who project manages our finances.

I: What is your impression of the external workers and their relations with and how they have dealt with the targets of the project?

O6: I think up till now the only person that really has contact with the targets is the principal agent and that the way I think it should be. Because all the other appointments even though IDT has appointed them should report to the principal agent. An engineer should never have to deal with reporting to targets. Neither should the QS most of this should come through the architect. I haven't had any complaints so I assume it's not best but its good [laughs].

I: So would you say that the external workers including the IDT and the architect and all the external workers do all of the planning for the targets?

O6: Yes

I: Do the targets then need to just approve the plans or do they give input into the plans?

O6: I think their input is garnished in the beginning of the programme. They do not really have to approve it. At some stage the final design has to be show cased.

I: And if they do not approve it?

O6: Well at first I would say 'so what' laughs but minor changes can probably still be affected but if they wanted the whole building turned around in a different way that would not be possible

I: And would that be negotiated with the principal?

O6: It would be evaluated because one person's suggestion might just deal with a small element but have a knock on effect on everything else. If it carries

merit it would then be costed. Financial impact and construction impact. And if it has merit it will be absorbed into the design.

I: So the money comes from IDT and the DoE. The money so far spent has been on the professionals on the demolition and any other place?

O6: No

I: Who manages the money?

O6: The IDT.

I: Who decided that IDT should manage the money?

O6: Through the programme implementation agreement.

I: With the DoE?

O6: Yes

I: Who is given information about how money is spent

O6: Our reporting structure would probably feed into the department of education

I: Could you summarise who's rights are being upheld through the project and how?

O6: The children's rights are being upheld the people employed by the school. The children's rights they have the right to education in a safe environment. The people working at the school have the right to be working in a safe environment I suppose the rights of targets to have a facility in their community.

I: Who are the project leaders?

O6: One of the leaders would be the school principal, the principal agent, IDT, some of the DoE officials and the senior school teachers.

I: And how would you just briefly describe their involvement in the project

O6: I think they are involved to differing degrees where the principal would now be sort of a monitoring observing and also filtering information into the group, IDT would be more the management of it. The education department would be the overseer of everything target community would really be monitoring and beneficiaries of it

I: And the external developers

O6: The professional team – they are really just there to do the work

I: has the vision of the project changed since its first inception?

O6: No

I: Do you have minute?

O6: Yes

I: We've discussed what's been left out and why from the master plan, high expectations of the community, who's been consulted in terms of those changes. How much do you think the norms and standards and the budget and the timeframes have affected people's participation in this project?

O6: In the beginning it wasn't a big factor but now it has become a big factor the time frame especially that we have to spend a certain amount of money before the end of March so the time for participation it's gone we have to now run with what we've got. Another thing is that the budget does not allow us to construct what we would like to. We are now limited in terms of our design and our thinking and things like that. In the beginning it wasn't really viewed as big but right now it's moved from urgent to critical.

I: Were there any feedback opportunities or negotiations or assurances that the teacher's suggestions would be taken.

O6: Not that I know of [the architect] the principal agent might have been going that in the back ground.

(End of interview. Thanks exchanged and goodbyes said)